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Abstract

This thesis addresses the perennial difficulties faced by Queen’s University’s administration in its failings to recognize the importance of an adequate contemporary First Nations presence within any twenty-first century Canadian institution of higher learning. Paying attention to the requests and demands of the immediate First Nations campus and community population over the last twenty years, I re-visit university attempts to manage issues of ‘equity’ and ‘diversity’ through non-organic solutions.

Using Edward Soja’s theory of Thirdspace, and his concept of a ‘trialectics of space’ I analyze a range of historical and contemporary cultural practices that include macro and micro governance and policy issues. I review the how the space of Queen’s is perceived; I follow how space is conceived in recommendations and requests made to Queen’s administration by First Nations university and community members; and finally I write about how transformations of lived space can bring about institutional change. By pairing feminist and Indigenous methodologies, I suggest that until the Thirdspace is recognized as part of an important cycle of educational and cultural change, the University space will remain inaccessible for many First Nations students, staff and faculty.

I also include a background of legislation in Canada; the Royal Proclamation of 1763, the Indian Act of 1876, and the Canadian Multiculturalism Act of 1988. These legal documents each served to define, restrict or contain the space in which First Nations live and work, and they need to be included as further background to what Toby Miller refers to as the structural limits of legislating difference in cultural-capitalist nation-state spaces.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

Figure 1: Part 1 of Aboriginal Council Visioning Map. Orloff, A. (2011). (With additions made by Mimi Gellman). Aboriginal Council of Queen’s University, Kingston, ON. This map has been divided into two parts so the texts is legible, as much as possible.
This project is representative of a particular time and space at Queen's University. After years of focused reports and reviews of reports concerning race and
racialization on Queen's campus, First Nation staff, students and faculty still have not seen their communities adequately represented in the space of the University. After the Principal's Advisory Committee Report (1991) and the Henry Report (2004), Queen's University made some visible changes to include Othered histories in the construction of space. Although not nearly enough of the suggested changes have been instituted, the Robert Sutherland Hall in the John-Deutsch University Centre, and now a new building with the same namesake, indicate that a potential shift was taking place within the culture of Queen's. Indigenous members of this academic community, however, have not seen the same kinds of changes to make the campus reflect the rich history of Indigenous cultural and academic contributions to Queen's.

One of the ways in which the Aboriginal Council of Queen's, the members of the Four Directions Aboriginal Student Centre and the staff of the Human Rights and Equity Office have sought to communicate what they perceive as the reality of, ideal outcome for and the processes towards revisioning Queen's University as a First Nations thirdspace is contained within the Aboriginal Council Visioning Map (Fig. 1 and 2). I explain the process by which this map came to be produced, and the broader history of the aforementioned reports, in Chapter Three of this thesis. I want to locate the origins of my project within this map because it served as a constant reminder throughout my research that space is created in multiple sites, moments, and contexts, and no one document could possibly unlock the transformation of space. This map is in one sense a static record of a lived moment in a particular place, but its energy and dynamism breathe
life into the spaces on campus where it can be found. It speaks to the vitality of Queen's First Nations community members, and provides insight into how to become an ally in the struggle for recognition in this space. This unusual document is an example of how Thirdspace - lived space - can possibly be captured in textual form yet remain a living document. It invites everyone on Queen's to engage in the discussions that took place at the meeting site of its inception, and so is a contact zone made manifest through visual art.

In part, this project is contained within a broader discussion of First Nation’s access to and engagement in post-secondary education in Canada. The “issue” of Native education has been an ongoing focus of the Canadian Press for some time. A common misconception is that Native students achieve minimal educational goals, and often drop out of secondary or postsecondary schools due to the difficulties they face at home. While high attrition rates are certainly a concern, many reporters miss the point that the difficulties do not lie mainly with Native students, but with the educational institutions throughout Canada that reproduce a “culture of Whiteness” through curricula, library holdings, seminar topics, building design, classroom structure, etc. These elements contribute to the construction of a space where Native students feel Indigenous ways of

---

1 The Aboriginal Council Visioning Map has been posted in Gordon Hall, where the Registrar’s office is located, in the Cultural Studies student lounge, in the Four Directions Aboriginal Student Centre, among other public sites on campus.

2 For example, the recent edition of TV Ontario’s The Agenda with Steve Paikin in 2010 in which four First Nations students, educators and administrators, including Queen’s Phd student Mimi Gellman, were invited to speak about the educational gap between White and Native students

3 This term appeared in the “Henry Report” created in 2004 for the Senate Educational Equity Committee, a review created by Frances Henry concerning allegations of racism on Queen’s Campus. These allegations were verified by the report that suggested there exists a “culture of whiteness” on campus which alienates persons of colour and Aboriginal student, staff, and faculty.
being are not honoured or reflected. While a genealogical study of curricula, archival and library holdings would be productive, I have chosen to focus on “space” and “place” in this project, rather than on the more focused issues. I chose to not produce a genealogical study in part because I am trying, like the creators of the Map which opens this project, to not delve into the details of how change has or could be wrought in isolated instances but rather how the entire campus needs to undergo a "critical thirding". One of my critiques is that there are sites on campus where Indigeneity is represented in ways that are recognizable to First Nations communities, such as the Four Directions Aboriginal Student Centre or the many exhibitions of First Nations’ art at the Agnes Etherington Art Centre. Focusing on these sites, however, would lose the more holistic approach to spatial construction and obscure how space is linked to a particular climate at Queen's. I have chosen to do this following the tradition of the Henry Report (2004) in which Dr. Frances Henry describes a particular “climate” in which non-White members on Queen’s campus feel alienated and disempowered (Henry, 2004). Although this is a difficult task, I want to understand more broadly how this climate is created through a culmination of many elements, including library and archive holdings, but not excluding how space is created by what is or is not taking place at Graduation Ceremonies, for example, or the geographical marginalization of the Four Directions Centre.\(^4\) I ask, why are spaces for living, discussing, engaging and interacting so important to the “issue” of Native

\(^{4}\) I bring these two examples to the fore as they are two of the many suggestions embedded in the Aboriginal Council Visioning Map (Fig.1 and 2).
education? How can these spaces undergo a “critical thirding”?\(^5\) Using Edward Soja’s theory of the “ontology of spatiality” (1996), I suggest that until lived spaces are made accessible, policies, reports and reviews will do little to reconstruct university campuses to be more welcoming to and inclusive of Native students, staff and faculty.

The spaces in which Indigeneity are explored, celebrated, discussed and maintained, within the physical geography and history of a colonial institution such as Queen’s University, are of particular interest to this study. How can the culture of a given place be remade through actions that alter space, social structures, and histories? I have focused on the particular space of the university as a result of the transformative experiences I have had as a Cultural Studies graduate student at Queen’s University. For example, I have learned that some Native communities reject the word “Aboriginal” as it is the official categorization of the state and not the chosen word of Native communities. Also, despite the fact that Pow Wows take place on Queen’s campus, this cultural practice is not traditional to the Haudenosaunee on whose land the university sits, were essential to my research.\(^6\) Thus the journey towards an understanding of how my identity affects my research framework took place within the space of academia. This is why I have come to believe that universities are potential epicenters for Canadian cultural change, as this change could simultaneously occur on both educational and politico-cultural levels. I am arguing that this nation-state will not be considered an acceptable

\(^5\) This term, in use throughout Soja’s text (1996), is used to describe the process through which institutions, organizations or other social spaces are analyzed as Thirdspaces. To “undergo a critical thirding”, these spaces are rendered unfamiliar through discourse and transformations in human use.

\(^6\) I received this knowledge from a Queen’s student who emailed me after learning about my project from another member of the Queen’s Native Student Association (QNSA).
space for many First Nations until academic centres are opened up to include the true history of Canada and the knowledges of the many cultures that have lived here for thousands of years before Europeans arrived.

There are some universities that are attempting to do this, and they are successful as long as the space of the university changes according to the requests of Native staff, students and faculty. The administration of the University of Manitoba, for example, agreed with the director of the Native student centre, Kali Storm, that creating designated smudging areas where members of the School could cleanse their spirits at their convenience, despite the no smoking by-laws that usually prohibit these cleanses, would be an excellent way to “engage and retain” Native students, staff and faculty (MacQueen, 2001). Another example of a successful change to a university space would that of Trent University, where a highly respected Mohawk Faithkeeper from Ahkwesahsne, Skahendowaneh Swamp, was awarded the position of Chair of Indigenous Knowledge. The position within Trent’s Indigenous Studies Department is the first academic chair of its kind in North America and creates an environment of respect for Native traditions and knowledges. Understandably, the main space where Indigenous knowledge and culture is given primacy in an academic setting would be the First Nations University of Canada, which has campuses in Regina, Saskatoon, and Prince Albert. Significantly, the main building on the Regina campus, designed by Douglas

---

7 I use Maclean’s writer MacQueen’s term here because it is so prevalent in popular literature about Native students in post-secondary institutions. I am uncomfortable with the term, however, as it erases the agency of the students in question and produces a bizarre image of detained or trapped Native students.

8 Trent University Indigenous Studies Department Faculty Page, available at: [http://www.trentu.ca/academic/nativestudies/faculty.html](http://www.trentu.ca/academic/nativestudies/faculty.html)
Cardinal, is architecturally inspired by the conical openness of the teepee, which is clearly visible from the main entrance. This visual signifier communicates to incoming students that Native cultural knowledges and histories will be present in this space. These examples are important to an understanding of the kind of elements which remake space on a university campus. While some projects might be unmanageable in the short term, such as constructing a new building, other options are accessible to a University administration that seeks to address certain neocolonial practices.

Much Native scholarship has assisted me in this research project. Bonita Lawrence, a self-described “mixed-blood urban Native”, grew up in a family that struggled to render their Native identity “meaningless” in a White-dominated environment (Lawrence, 2004). Lawrence is thus heavily invested in the relativity of cultural contingency theories. In the Preface to her book “Real” Indians and Others, she states that it took years for her to rediscover the strength and importance of her family history. For her, and other “urban mixed-bloods” she interviewed for her study, identity does depend upon the context in which it is signified, but is not completely malleable or fluid.

In order for the space of the university to change, however, I agree with Emerance Baker that a “decolonization” process also needs to archive the knowledges Native scholars and students are studying and creating (Baker, 2008). In other words, looking at what is actually happening on campuses already, rather than what needs to happen or

---

what isn’t happening, is an important step in the process of spatial change. What does Native resistance to Eurocentric policies, implementation of policies, curricula, and research subjects look like? Some have argued that dropping out or “stopping out” are themselves indicators of Native resistance and protest (Lavell, 2004). Besides response-based behaviour, what new actions and initiatives are being carried out by Native students, faculty and their supporters on Canadian campuses? In this study, I will pose this question in relation to the Queen’s University campus in Kingston, Ontario.

Chapter One will provide a context for the use of “bureaucratic solutions to diversity” in North America, a concept which has been borrowed from Richard Day, described below. This chapter will begin with the so-called solution to racial conflict embedded in the Royal Proclamation of 1763, and will then follow through to the Indian Act and its various amendments. I will briefly look at the Canadian Multiculturalism Act of 1988 in terms how this Act collapses a multitude of different identity groups into the category of “ethnic groups” and then reifies the White subject as the national standard. What will become obvious is that a great deal of discussing, legislating and policy-making has been carried out by Canada’s national institutions, yet racism and discrimination are still daily occurrences for many in Canada.

Chapter Two will be a theoretical chapter, explaining how Edward Soja’s concepts of the ontology of spatiality work as a fluid cycle of change, but only if perceived space, conceived space, and lived space undergo a restructuring practice. Soja describes these three spaces as Firstspace, Secondspace, and Thirdspace, and throughout
my project I will do the same. I briefly dialogue Soja’s theory with a snapshot of Vine Deloria Jr.’s scholarship in order to describe how some Native communities, that of the Standing Rock Sioux in this instance, perceive spatiality. This section is intended to show how Indigenous knowledges can interlace with and expand upon Western scholarship on space. I do this not to set up a binary but rather to illuminate the kinds of conversations that would be possible if more of the University space were opened up to include these cultural knowledges. Due to the importance of thinking through whose cultural frameworks are most relevant to a study of the space of Queen’s university, I tried to include Mohawk scholarship as much as possible in this thesis. However, I did not find direct reference to space and spatiality in the work of the Mohawk scholarship with which I engaged. Far from being a decision based on a belief in “pan-Indigeneity”, I found Vine Deloria Jr.’s discussion of Sioux spatial epistemologies to be the best link with and contrast to Soja’s text.

I chose Soja’s theory of *Thirdspace* (1996) because it overlaps with questions surrounding the space of the university. In describing his theory in the initial pages of the introduction, Soja addresses the limitations of binary discussions about modernity and postmodernity that were taking place within the academy in the mid-1990s. He reminds the reader that “*il y a toujours l’Autre*” (There is always the Other); a third possibility that combines some elements of each but creates a new, hybrid epistemological critique.

Soja’s concept of Thirdspace also articulates well with Cornel West’s seminal text “The New Cultural Politics of Difference” (1990). In this text, which finishes with an
analysis of the university space, West suggests that the ideal response to the “existential challenge” posed by being in a White space is to neither embrace nor reject dominant cultural ideologies completely, but to choose elements from both dominant and marginalized discourses that form a third, hybridized cultural perspective.

Finally, Chapter Three will be look at the historical space of Queen’s University. A brief history of the spatial construction of this institution will be followed by a description of the textual analyses of space contained within the Principal’s Advisory Committee Report (1991), the Henry Report (2003), and the Aboriginal Council Report (2011). This section will be followed by a narrative of a Pow Wow which took place on Queen’s campus on October 1st, 2011. This telling is a modest experience of how Thirdspace is the site in which knowledge is lived, power is negotiated, political issues are raised, and culture is celebrated. This chapter will conclude with suggestions for why and how these kinds of spaces are needed in increased numbers on Queen’s campus.

**Literature Review**

Of great importance to my study was Richard J. F. Day’s book, *Multiculturalism and the History of Canadian Diversity* (2000). This text establishes that “diversity” in Canada is set up as a discursive formation, and that there exists a particular official method of “dealing with” diversity in Canada. Diversity in this context refers to the differentiation between ethno-cultural groups, which has long been set up as a “problem” by the French and later British colonialists who became the Canadian government.
Multicultural policy was established in the Trudeau period as a top-down, rational-bureaucratic “solution” to diversity, which threatened a (mythical) national unity (Day, 2000). Day argues that multiculturalism is not a long-standing practice in Canada, as numerous governmental documents have insisted, but rather is the juridical manifestation of a set of practices pertaining to the treatment of a) Native nations by the French, and b) French, Native, and Immigrant subjects by the English. He traces Western concepts of difference and relates how a racist hierarchy of identities dates back to the time of Herodotus, the “father of Ethnography” (p.48). He explains how the discourse of Canadian diversity was (mis)informed by the stratification of Ionian Hellenic identities, the incorporation of the Other in Roman Imperialism, the missionary urge of the Early Christians, and finally the Renaissance construction of the New World “Savage”. The Old World ideas and methods for shaming, assimilating, and eliminating non-White individuals ultimately led to a very particular relationship between European colonists, Native Nations, and Other(ed) nationalities who arrived on Canadian soil as immigrants and settlers (Day, 2000). Day reveals a facet of the history of the “settler-nation” mythology and goes on to explain why the perpetuation of this myth has damaging implications for White and non-White Canadians.

Another useful text is *Exalted Subjects*, by Sunera Thobani (2007). Thobani describes the “Canadian subject” as a trope, resurrected and reinforced throughout Canadian history as a representation. State-sponsored master narratives define the national subject’s character as a negative relationship not only to the externally
threatening American, but also to internal Others, whom she strategically reduces to “the Indian, the immigrant, and the refugee” (Thobani, 2007, p.5). These Canadian “Others” are forever positioned as threatening to “core” Canadians who are White, English or French speaking, and descended from European colonial settlers. As with Day, Thobani traces the historical development of hierarchical identity groups within the Canadian immigration system. In the early to mid-twentieth century, this selection occurred literally through head taxes and other restrictions that limited entry to “desirable”, mainly European, immigrants (Thobani, 2007). Concepts of Canadian “beneficence” have now replaced earlier sentiments of moral and racial superiority, but the social hierarchies evident at the turn of the twentieth century have remained largely the same (Thobani, 2007).

There has been a great deal of literature in the United States about Native American education, although much of this has focused on “deficit models”, which attempt to explain why Native students drop out, stop out, or “neglect” to enroll in higher education in the first place (Swisher & Tippeconnic, 1999). More specific to my focus is what Karen Swisher and John Tippeconnic refer to in Next Steps: Research and Practice to Advance Indian Education (1999) as a “tribal self-determination” model of research, where Native students are not blamed for the rate of Native attrition in higher education.10

Terry Huffman, in American Indian Higher Educational Experiences:

10 Among the many texts on Native Education in both the American and Canadian contexts are David Wallace Adam’s Education for Extinction (1995); Marie Battiste’s Protecting Indigenous Knowledge and Heritage: A Global Challenge (2000); K.P. Binda and Sharilyn Calliou’s Aboriginal Education in Canada: A Study in Decolonization (2001); Gregory Cajete’s Look to the Mountain: An Ecology of Indigenous
Cultural Visions and Personal Journeys (2008), identifies at least four kinds of Native students: assimilated, marginal, estranged, and transcultural (Huffman, 2008, p.10). I am unclear as to the benefit of reducing students to four ontological categories in this way. Huffman, who is not Native himself, after conducting 69 interviews with students over 5 years, came to the conclusion that at least two-thirds of Native students either do not have any conflicts as a result of their experience in college, or their conflicts have served to reinforce their Native identities in a positive way (p.17). Huffman’s study emphasizes Native students who speak favourably about higher education. He focuses on the students rather than on the space the students inhabit, again suggesting that the solution lies in their ability to be flexible, accommodating and stoic. Students that were able to become “transcultured” were described as having an “enhanced vision” (p.146), which indicates that progress here is measured by the students’ abilities to obtain high grades, maintain friendships and navigate a system that was only moderately challenged by Huffman’s research.

In contrast, Indigenizing the Academy: Transforming Scholarship and Empowering Communities (2004) editors Devon Abbott Mihesuah and Angela Wilson present articles written by Native scholars. The essays in this book have several key themes, such as the colonial atmosphere of upper education, the lack of support for Indigenous scholarship, and the existence of individuals “posing” as Native American

Education (1994); Marlene Brant Castellano et al’s Aboriginal Education: Fulfilling the Promise (2000); Battiste and Jean Barman’s First Nations Education in Canada: The Circle Unfolds (1995); Colin Calloway’s The Indian History of an American Institution: Native Americans and Dartmouth (2010); and the entire Canadian Journal of Native Education.
professors in order to fill quotas, legitimize research projects, or be nominated for external funding. Several powerful scholars, such as Vine Deloria Jr., Taiaiake Alfred, and Daniel Heath Justice, who normally write broadly about Native concerns, contributed their thoughts about life in academic institutions to this text.

The introduction of *Indigenizing the Academy* is especially important for an understanding of what University spaces are currently, but also what they could be. Mihesuah and Wilson state that “Indigenizing the academy” means “to carve a space where Indigenous values and knowledge are respected; to create an environment that supports research and methodologies useful to Indigenous nation building; to support one another as institutional foundations are shaken; and to compel institutional responsiveness to Indigenous issues, concerns, and communities” (p. 2). All four of these points focus on the need to restructure and remake the space of the University. In other words, these articles reinforced the notion that much of what is “deficient” about life for Native students in Universities has to do with the Universities themselves, regardless of the students’ backgrounds, abilities, emotional development, or financial needs.

Canadian literature on this topic includes two books that assisted me in this project: *First Nations in the Twenty-First Century: Contemporary Education Frontiers* (2005), by John Friesen and Virginia Lyons Friesen, and *Reclaiming Indigenous Voice and Reason* (2000), edited by Marie Battiste. The Friesen and Friesen text is an overview

---

11 This book, highly regarded by Native scholars, is more about the issue of Native academics reproducing Eurocentric scholarship than the issue of pure-blooded Native heritage, though this charged issue is present.
of the issues affecting First Nations in public, secondary and post-secondary schools from the point of view of Native communities, particularly the authors’ Sioux Nation. The importance of providing an historical context to the charge of Eurocentrism in academic institutions is exemplified by this text, which begins with a review of the history of First Nations education. This sets up the following sections, which emphasize the importance of spirituality, leadership, language, self-identity, curricula, and teaching, all of which are considered by Friesen and Friesen as vital to understanding First Nations education.

In *Reclaiming Indigenous Voice and Reason* (2000), Battiste discusses the “cognitive imperialism” which became a useful, accurate description for many scholars who succeeded her in this field (Baker, 2008). In her own article, Battiste states that “the military, political, and economic subjugation of Native peoples has been well documented, as have social, cultural, and linguistic pressures and the ensuing detrimental consequences to First Nations communities, but no force has been more effective at oppressing First Nations cultures than the educational system” (Battiste, 2000, p.193). It is for this reason that I have chosen to understand some of the embedded cultural practices of post-secondary institutions.

**Terminology**

Throughout this project I refer to Native peoples, Native cultures, and Native Nations, rather than Aboriginal peoples, cultures, and nations. I do this consciously to reflect on Taiaiake Alfred’s statement that for him the word “Aboriginal” refers to
assimilated Native subjects because it is the state’s official word for Native peoples (Alfred, 2005, p.24). I also want to use the term Native Nations as often as possible to remind some readers that there were, prior to European invasion of North America, sovereign Nations on this land who had their own governments, justice systems, histories, cultural knowledges, natural sciences, religions, large-scale agricultural operations and trading networks. On occasion I also use the word Amerindian following Olive Patricia Dickason, who used this word in Canada’s First Nations (2002) because it is closest to the French *amérindien* which many Native writers prefer to *autochtone* for the same reasons that “Aboriginal” is rejected. In addition, “Amerindian” is an acceptable word in both Canadian and American culture, whereas “Native” is less widely accepted in the States. Dickason felt this was important as a great deal of history in the Americas occurred before there were differentiated nations on either side of the US-Canada border.

I refer to White people in this text because my culture is too often considered a non-culture, the rational standard to which all Othered cultures are held. In order to transcend our own cultural beliefs and practices, and to see these for the arbitrary and often narrow-minded practices they are, we need to rethink our cultural values from an outside point of view. It is my hope that by placing Whites in a clear cultural group, both White and non-White readers will understand that I am analyzing a cultural space by taking into account critical race theory and Native scholarship.
Chapter 2

A Short Review of Identity Legislation in Canada

To begin, let me agree with Richard Day that “diversity”, or the presence in a given space of civic subjects with varying ages, abilities, genders and cultural backgrounds, is not a problem that requires a solution (Day, 2000). As Day argues, there is no evidence to suggest that diverse communities will always generate situations of conflict or animosity. In Canada’s rich history of attempts to “deal with” diversity (Day, 2000), the Royal Proclamation (1763), the Indian Act (1876), and the Canadian Multiculturalism Act (1988) have defined Native rights, sovereignty over land and education, and participation in the democratic process. This chapter will map out this limited list of bureaucratic “solutions” to diversity that have failed to adequately address ongoing colonial practices in North America. I refer to these Proclamations and Acts as “tactics” because they reveal underlying presumptions about the power dynamics between Native Nations and White Euroamericans. Although they differ in historical context and overall rhetoric, these tactics are all efforts on the part of the nation-state to exert control over how people of colour and First Nations are represented, treated, and contained by Whites (Thobani, 2007). Matters of culture and citizenship, as Toby Miller has written, are even more complex in the way they can limit the ambitions of social movements. And here I am characterizing First Nations self-determination as a social movement. Miller writes,

Ultimately, cultural-capitalist states cannot enshrine differential accounts of the person in their doctrines of sovereignty, because that would require a revolution
in the liberal, humanist, proprietorial subject that underpins their laws of property and methods of collecting and distributing revenue and service. This would, in its turn, imply a new economy and polity. The discourse of citizenship is therefore limited because its indeterminacy - the questioning it encourages - only goes to the spread of services within a given type of social organization, not to the shape of that society or the means of defining and dividing it up. And the work of cultural policy inside this discourse, while relatively autonomous from issues of capital accumulation and state security, does not finally encourage different, dissident cultures of conduct. Its need to form a singular public is too pressing to be that supple (Miller, 1993, p.230).

What I am outlining in this chapter are bureaucratic solutions that did not meet their respective goals. The Royal Proclamation did not eliminate animosity between citizens, the Indian Act did not create a more functional nation or colony, and the Canadian Multiculturalism Act did not unify the country or satisfy the demands of the subaltern for recognition and accommodation. I am bringing these failures to light to suggest not that they could have worked if the wording was altered or the right people were consulted, but rather that top-down cultural administrations can never accomplish social change unless they account for the creation of spaces in which non-dominant groups can be recognized culturally, politically and/or spiritually.

How these governance documents are connected to the study of Queen’s University should be clear considering the ways in which the University governance structure imitates that of the Canadian Parliament. The existence of a Senate and the rules of order and ritualistic behaviour during faculty and board meetings are part of this mimicry. The stakeholders in the institution, including students, staff and faculty, are represented in policy documents only insofar as they aid in the formation of a “singular public”, as are citizens in the cultural policies of the nation-state (Miller, 1999).
To aid me in interpretations of the following legislation, I have used the texts of Olive Dickason (2002) to provide context and background for the Royal Proclamation and the Indian Act, Bonita Lawrence (2004) who wrote about the effects of the Indian Act on the identity of “urban mixed-blood” Native communities, and Richard Day (2000) to understand the historical continuity of the problematic relationship between citizens and the nation-state created by the Canadian Multiculturalism Act.

The Royal Proclamation, 1763

For the British colonies, the first legislation that attempted to “deal with” diversity with legal recourse on a continental scale was the Royal Proclamation of 1763 (Lawrence, 2004, p.29-30). Created by King George III, the Royal Proclamation stipulated that the area east of the Mississippi River and west of the Appalachian Mountains should be considered the property of the Crown that has been set aside for “the several Nations or Tribes of Indians with Whom We are connected, and who live under our Protection” (Royal Proclamation). To end the Seven Years’ War, representatives of the British Crown insisted that the badly beaten French sign the Treaty of Paris (1763) and leave North America to the British, excepting New Orleans and the islands St.Pierre and Miquelon off the southern tip of Newfoundland (Fowler, 2005). The Royal Proclamation stated that if Native Tribes were further “molested or disturbed”, the British Crown would take the offense as one committed against their own authority. It was a “hastily written” (Fowler, 2005) document that was intended to end conflict
between the First Nations and British settlers, and it did not empower any other party except the British state.

The sudden expulsion of the French from the Canadas left many First Nations in an extremely vulnerable position in Upper Canada and on the east coast. Many factions of the League of Five Nations\textsuperscript{12} had established strong trading networks with the French in the early 1700s, and were finally enjoying relative stability and economic health. The Mi’kmaq were especially hard hit, as the French on the east coast had maintained the alliance of this Nation through regular gifts and profitable trade (Dickason, 2002). The British dealt very differently with the Native Nations than had the French, and Native communities protested the building of forts on their land, and the high-handed manner with which the British settlers dealt with Native traders and Tribes (Fowler, 2005). After Sir William Johnson convened a peace conference at Fort Niagara in 1764, the Federation of Seven Fires\textsuperscript{13} realized that the British settlers, despite their words and paper treaties, would not honour Amerindian rights to the land, and would only seek to further unbalance the long-established trading networks and alliances between the Nations in Upper Canada (Dickason, 2002, p.160). In an attempt to save their lands from further theft, a series of attacks occurred at trading posts and the English sustained heavy

\textsuperscript{12} The League of Five became the Iroquois League of Six Nations, includes Mohawk, Oneida, Onondaga, Cayuga, and Seneca, and later the Tuscarora in 1722 (Dickason, 2002, p.52).

\textsuperscript{13} A league composed of tribes from the Iroquois, Algonquins, Hurons, Abenakis, and Nippissing Nations who lived along the St.Lawrence in the 1700s and were allies of New France (Dickason, 2002, p.160)
casualties for which they later sought retribution in the form of gifting disease-ridden blankets.\textsuperscript{14}

What is useful to note about the Royal Proclamation is that it was the first time on the continent of North America that a piece of legislation was created that simultaneously established the authority of a modern nation-state over other(ed) groups of people on such a massive geographic scale. It was a prescription for later documents which dealt more explicitly with how and where First Nations could live, and also a rubric for later tactics which similarly appeared to improve the living conditions for Amerindians but instead reinforced the hegemony (Gramsci, 1971).

\textit{The Indian Act, 1876}\textsuperscript{15}

As American “Manifest Destiny” took hold in the mid-nineteenth century\textsuperscript{16}, British Canada saw the opportunity to “piggyback” off the violence of these conflicts

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item Chief Obwandiag (a.k.a. Chief Pontiac) of the Odawa Anishinaabeg Nation was especially powerful in his ability to rally members of the Federation of Seven Fires to oppose the theft of their ancestral lands by the English. Between 1766-69, over 2,000 Europeans (British and some remaining French) died as the result of Native attacks and raids on settlements and forts, a resistance that eventually became unsustainable for the Iroquois, and so ended. Subsequent peace treaties did not preclude the decision made by Lord Jeffrey Amherst to gift smallpox infested blankets to the Algonquin and Delaware, as retribution for the Native attacks (Dickason, 2002).
\item I have omitted the Crown Lands Protection Act of 1839, with which the British declared all Native lands to be Crown Lands, thus both protecting and containing Native rights to the use of the land (Dickason, 2002, p.225). I have also omitted the Act for Civilizing and Enfranchising Indians, legislation which John A. Macdonald pushed through in 1859. I have omitted this legislation because it was so unsuccessful; the privatization of reserved lands was impossible to enforce at the time, so only one candidate was ever enfranchised under the Act (Dickason, p.229). Although these Acts did effect First Nations’ rights and mobility, they are not the same as identity legislation which aimed to create “national unity” or at least a cessation of conflict.
\item The mid nineteenth century quasi-spiritual belief of Democratic-Republicans in the Thirteen American Colonies that they possessed the Divine right to expand across the North American continent, which they did, ultimately resulting in the conquest of Mexico (Heidler & Heidler, 2003).
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
with Native Nations to retain control over northern tribes (Lawrence, p.32). Treaties between the First Nations and the Canadian government were forced through fear, and it was during this tense climate that the first definition of an “Indian” appeared in the British North American Act. It was no coincidence that the very Act which established Canada as a sovereign Nation consciously delineated who was a national subject and who was an “Indian” subject.17

When voluntary enfranchisement for Native men failed to attract enough men to Western ways of living, involuntary enfranchisement was implemented between 1920 and 1922, then again between 1933 and 1951 (Lawrence, 2004, p.32). During these times, if a Native man was educated, he lost his Indian status but gained the right to own property. As reserve lands were subdivided into lots in the 1869 amendment of the Act, enfranchisement also meant that these men could sell their plots of Reserve land. In this way, many thousands of acres of Native lands were sold to Whites, often for a fraction of their worth. The longstanding racism imbedded in this legislation was made clear in 1920 by the Superintendent of the Department of Indian Affairs, Duncan Campbell Scott, who stated that the Canadian State would persist with involuntary enfranchisement “until there is not a single Indian in Canada”.18 Indeed, this sentiment was echoing one made by the Prime Minister in 1887, when he stated that “the great aim of our legislation has been to

---

17 The Métis, however, were not considered national subjects nor were they given Indian status, an act on the part of the Canadian state which would prove disastrous in 1885 (Dickason, 2002).
18 Quoted in Lawrence, 2004, p.32.
do away with the tribal system and assimilate the Indian people in all respects with the other inhabitants of the Dominion as speedily as they are fit to change”. 19

Macdonald was referring in part to the 1869 Gradual Enfranchisement Act which bypassed the tribal governments formerly recognized by the Royal Proclamation, and shifted political organization to a band system, thereby completely eliminating the political existence of each Nation. Each band then came under the purview of an Indian Agent who had the right to appoint chiefs they felt would be expedient to state initiatives and veto any chief or council member whom they considered inappropriate or inexpedient (Dickason, 2002, p.238). Arbitrary legislation was implemented to diminish the power of Native women in particular. For instance, eastern Nations were most affected when the state prohibited matrifocal practices, insisting instead that women join their husbands’ communities after marriage (Lawrence, 2004, p.32).

It was no coincidence that the Northwest Rebellion took place five years following the creation of the Department of Indian Affairs in 1880. For Plains Cree and Ojibwa Tribes, the trespassing laws against non-status Indians were an enormous insult to their communities and their Métis relatives and friends. The events leading up to “The Northwest Rebellion” of 1885 have been so frequently made the subject of study that I will try to be as brief as the narrative here will allow. As a result of the lobbying efforts of Louis Riel and the Red River Valley supporters, the Canadian Government granted the Métis and Cree Nations the Province of Manitoba in 1870. In 1885, after continuous

harassment from the North West Mounted Police (NWMP) and Indian Agents about their disinclination to support the Reserve Movement, Riel demanded the rights promised to his people fifteen years before. The ensuing disturbing chapter is well known; the NWMP acted swiftly to shatter the westward expansion of the resistance by overpowering Riel and his following, jailing 50 Métis and Cree, hanging Riel along with 10 other Cree leaders, including Chief Mistahi-maskwa (Big Bear) and Chief Pitikwahanapiwiyin (Poundmaker) (Lawrence, 2004, p.34).

Lawrence writes about the extensive aftermath of the Northwest Rebellion in terms of legislation and policy within the Department of Indian Affairs. Suddenly, Plains bands were labelled “loyal” or “disloyal”, and the latter were punished by withholding government monies, confiscating horses, and dispersing some bands into other, more trustworthy communities. She describes how, despite the ongoing Native-Settler warfare in the United States, many Cree fled to the south out of fear of the Canadian state. She also reminds us that this was the same era that the Pot Latch on the West Coast and the Sun Dance on the Plains were banned, and Residential Schools were made compulsory.

In terms of controlling and containing First Nations in Canada, the Northwest Rebellion was a huge success for the Canadian nation-state.

From the turn of the century until 1951, there were over a dozen amendments and changes to the Indian Act, which collectively eliminated Native rights to assembly, freedom of movement, right to trade, and the ability to organize to legally lobby for their rights (Lawrence, p. 36). For example, according to Lawrence, in 1927 the Canadian
government made it illegal for Native Tribes to request money or be given money to hire a lawyer for land-claims actions against the State without first obtaining the permission of the State through Indian Agents. However, municipal judges retained their right, established in 1911, to physically move an entire reserve from one acreage of land to another if they felt it “expedient” to do so (p.36).

Amendments to the Act in 1951 are seen as a turning point by many nationalists, but not by many Native communities (Palmater, 2011). It is true that the laws hindering legal actions and political resistance were removed, but suddenly Canadian state child-welfare agencies had jurisdiction over reserves, which resulted in a “sixties scoop” not dissimilar to earlier theft of Native children for residential schools (Lawrence, 2004). The other major change that came about as a result of the 1951 Indian Act amendment was that Native women who married non-Native men lost their status, even if they married an American Indian of the same tribe (Palmater, 2011). Later, in 1985, this was reversed, but the state left the decision to reintegrate the generations of lost women at the discretion of each band council, so bands had to decide whether or not they were willing and able to accommodate an influx of (re)new(ed) bodies. Many decided against welcoming these women back into the community because it was unfeasible economically and spatially, or simply because they didn’t see the point (Palmater, 2011). In this way sovereignty has been dealt out in skillful ways so as to create the circumstances for inequitable community building, thus reinforcing the White view that Native bands are incapable of managing their own economic and political processes.
To emphasize the relevance of the Indian Act to the following study of spatiality and identity legislation, it should be clear that the British monarchy and later the Canadian government have attempted to quell Native uprisings and respond to Native demands for equality through the creation of laws that rarely accomplish these goals. The resentment that brought about the Northwest Rebellion went underground, and some Native scholars are keen to see the resurrection of Native militancy (Churchill, 2003; Alfred, 2005). As long as bureaucratic documents control official discussions about difference and diversity, Native communities will not have control over the administrative processes that affect their lives and cultures.

The Canadian Multiculturalism Act, 1988

The process to create the Canadian Multiculturalism Act began in 1985, and the Act was assented to on July 21, 1988. In this Act, the Multiculturalism Policy of Canada describes ten ways through which the Act is to be enforced generally through

---

20 I have omitted the Official Languages Act (1969), which was later amended in the Canadian Multiculturalism Act outlined here. Although the former affected First Nations communities, particularly in its insulting reification of French and English as the founding nations of Canada, the latter is more in line with the identity legislation that I wish to explore here. After much thought, I also admitted the rich history of the White Paper (1969), the Red Paper (1970), and the adoption of the National Indian Brotherhood’s Indian Control of Indian Education (1972), which turned into the Indian Control of Indian Education Act in 1973. The outcome and impact of this largely ineffectual Act is extremely interesting, and the response of the Assembly of First Nations and their study of the 1973 Act is relevant to a study of the context surrounding education in Canada. However, all of these papers effected elementary and secondary education, and although this provides a context from which Reserve youth emerge into the space of post-secondary institutions, they have not had a direct effect on the construction of university campuses and environments. More information can be found about this history in Marie Battiste and Jean Barman’s (Eds.) First Nations Education in Canada: The Circle Unfolds. Vancouver: UBC Press, 1995.

policy. These ten policies variously discuss fostering recognition and appreciation of diversity, promoting understanding and creativity that arise from diversity, and preserving and enhancing multiculturalism and inclusivity. In these policies and the following section, which describes the responsibilities of federal institutions vis-à-vis these policies, there is an emphasis on ethnic and cultural diversity, but clear definition of diversity nor distinction between First Nations and other non-White identities. Indeed, the Act describes all Canadian subjects as diverse - White, Native, and citizens of colour - and misses the opportunity to address the differences between these groups in terms of political representation and access to power. Native sovereignty, which has been actively sought since the nineteenth century by the First Nations and extremely well articulated in the 1970s and 1980s by the National Indian Brotherhood, is not considered in this document. Instead, the document strengthens the power of the nation-state over Canadian subjects through tactics such as the creation of the Canadian Human Rights Commission, formed to serve as a legal commission for hearing discrimination or racism charges between citizens or organizations. Questions thus arise, for instance, about why the Act did not provide for commissions that would be overseen and managed by Native councils. The Act allowed the state to stand in as arbiter of social justice, but clearly viewed racism against Black or Asian-Canadians, for instance, as being the same racism directed against Native peoples. When the issues of unratified land claims, lack of space and resources on Reserves, lost heritage and cultural assimilation for generations are completely different from the experiences of other non-White Canadians, placing all
“diverse” peoples in one category is a transparent move on the part of the state to contain and manage all non-Whites with one catch-all official document.

Thus, in Canada, with the Multiculturalism Act of 1988, the state proposed a legislated “solution” to the “problem” of diversity (Day, 2000). Cultural producers and activists have loudly decried the ineffectual strategies provided by this policy (McFarlane, 1995; Philip, 1992). Proponents of multiculturalism sought the reproduction of an ideal form of multicultural interaction which would bring about the unification of Canada, and critics of multiculturalism denounced the legislation for glossing over deeper political implications of cultural difference. This “gloss” has been described as a mere “representation” of unification and social cohesion, which many see as a governmental strategy to “sell” Canada’s diversity on the international stage (Abu-Laban & Gabriel, 2002).

By 1988, the Canadian system for “dealing with” diversity was to simultaneously celebrate and ignore difference. Cultural festivals began appearing across North America where food, dance and dress were placed on display, often during times when activists were protesting political upheaval in the nation-states or First Nations communities whose culture was being celebrated (Hume, 1988; Balfe, 1987; Wallis, 1994). The Act reads as a moral guide for acceptable behaviour towards people who are different (McFarlane, 1995), and Multiculturalism became a national ethos effective only in unifying the liberal majority in a spirit of celebration of White tolerance and beneficence (Thobani, 2007).
Many scholars have criticized the Canadian Multiculturalism Act for what they see as its abject failure to end racism and not all of them can be illuminated here. As Clive Robertson point out in *Policy Matters: Administrations of Art and Culture* (2006), these criticisms have real implications in the day to day operations of Canadian organizations and corporations. For example, when the Canada Council created the Advisory Committee on Racial Equity in 1990-91, the committee became polarized as some members found the Council’s promotion of multiculturalism and “refusal to accept an explicitly anti-racist framework” unacceptable (Robertson, 2006, p.54).

One of the best examples of how official Multiculturalism has failed to address issues of exclusion and uneven distribution of privilege can be found in the example provided by Nourbese Philip in her book *Frontiers: Selected Essays and Writings on Racism and Culture*, (1992). Philip, a Trinidadian-Canadian writer, was told by the Secretary of State of the Department of Multiculturalism and Citizenship that it wasn’t so much “excellence” that was considered in the selection criteria for arts and cultural funding decisions so much as projects with a “social change aspect” (p.127). The message of these projects “should be a prescriptive one which would move the community in question closer to integration into Canadian society” (p. 126). In other words, as long as visual, literary or performative projects conformed to notions of ideal citizenship provided by the morality projected in the Multiculturalism Act and many other pieces of state propaganda (Day, 2000), these projects would receive economic rewards.

This example is not a misinterpretation of the Act on the part of one state representative. Indeed, the text of the Act invites just such a reading. As Section 2(b) of

---

22 Among the many texts that criticize the Canadian Multiculturalism Act are Bannerji, 2000; Day, 2000; Gordon, 1996; Kymlicka, 2003; Mackey, 2002; Thobani, 2007.
the Canadian Multiculturalism Act states, “It is further declared to be the policy of the Government of Canada that all federal institutions shall promote policies, programs and practices that enhance the ability of individuals and communities of all origins to contribute to the continuing evolution of Canada”. What exactly does “evolution” mean in this context? Economic vitality? Interracial harmony? Ability to attract international industrial conglomerates? “Contribution” also remains undefined, and it is the malleability of phrases such as these that allows policy makers to interpret multiculturalism in a way that reproduces colonial racism. Of course, the opposite is true, that there is an opportunity to mold this text to an antiracist framework but without adequate discussion and understanding of antiracist frameworks in academia and in the public sphere this eventuality remains exceedingly unlikely.

It is this (co)incidence of the “ideal citizen” and this subject’s “contribution” to a chimeric, evolving Canada that defines national identity. As Toby Miller explains in The Well-Tempered Self (1993), postmodern nation-states, especially in liberal, democratic societies, are heavily invested in inscribing their cultural citizens with an “ethical incompleteness”. These citizens are then encouraged to rectify their incompleteness through greater adherence to an ideal subjecheidhood.

For First Nations, this ideal subjecheidhood is expressed in a multitude of ways. For some Whites, Native persons are expected to reproduce a specific relationship to nature, which Whites then attempt to “tap into” as a source of pure, direct linkage to ecological knowledge (Friedel, 2011). This perspective ironically does not extend to the acceptance
of Native claims to hunting and fishing rights, nor to sovereignty over their ancestral lands (Friedel, 2011). As explained above, imposing the societal norm of individualism and private property ownership is evident in the early legislation detailed above, particularly in the Canadian government’s persistent attempts to transform Native reserve lands into private plots. How this plays out in identity legislation is clear in the Indian Act, but is also clear in the Canadian Multiculturalism Act which sought to redefine the relationship between Whites and non-Whites in regards to employment and labour in particular. Exerting state control through labour laws, and cloaking this control through the rhetoric of identity legislation, has evidently been a tactic of the Canadian government since at least 1876.

The very existence of legislation designed to manage interpersonal interactions implies that the state considers its subjects incapable of self-management. It also implies that an ideal model for interaction exists. As the primary function of any government is to ensure its own reproduction, we can assume that the function of this ideal model for interaction within the space of the nation-state is imposed for the sake of the state. Multicultural policy solely exists for the perpetuation of the nation-state even as it is presented as a code of conduct intended to create a more harmonious civil society. This is why the state is able to ignore criticism that Multicultural Policy has in fact created greater discord and reinforced White supremacy. The actual goal of cultural policy is to create a better functioning society that will reproduce the state through the democratic process. Otherwise, if multiculturalism were to become actually antiracist, it would need
to address a colonial history and the current manifestations of this legacy. This would expose the overwhelming inadequacy of the state as a representation of the national body politic. In effect, it would mean the end of citizens’ faith in the state as a structure capable of organising civic life - a situation that is otherwise known as anarchy.

Conclusion

These days many organizations and corporations have adopted the institutional rhetoric of “equity”. Queen’s University, for example, has an equity policy that clearly states how discrimination is experienced systemically and defines how an inequitable “climate” is maintained (Queen’s University Equity Office, 2009). Treated as an advisory committee, the Equity Office has the support of many members of the administration but is not empowered to enforce equitable practices. In other words, even when bureaucratic tactics are actively antiracist, Whites in power in some Canadian institutions find other ways to empty this legislation of reform potential, often by neglecting to include key individuals who would support and reiterate the importance of antiracist frameworks in discussions where they could make a difference. The next

23 In fact, an anarchist state is preferable to a nation-state for many Onkwehonwe, or “original peoples”, according to by Taiaiake Alfred (2005, p.24). Anarcho-indigenism, he states, is a social organization that is, “...indigenous, evoking cultural and spiritual rootedness in this land and the Onkwehonwe struggle for justice and freedom, and the political philosophy and movement that is fundamentally anti-institutional, radically democratic, and committed to taking action to force change: anarchism” (p.45). Alfred is not suggesting here that Canada’s First Nations wish to overthrow Parliament, or act violently in any way, only that many Onkwehonwe are actively seeking collective engagement in the political processes that effect them, and are creatively incorporating concepts of alternative government systems.
chapter will deal more specifically with the importance of space for affecting lasting change in these environments.
Chapter 3

Placemaking, Critical Thirding and the University Space

How are places made? What does placemaking look like? Who is empowered to make or transform a given place? What can be learned from spatial transformations? Can temporary spatial transformations effect lasting change?

These are some of the questions that underpin my readings about place formation and spatial epistemologies. “Placemaking” can be described as the social construction of spirituality and culture in a given locale, such as monument building or site (re)naming. In the Western world, the term originated with Carl Sauer and the Berkeley cultural geographers, but was also a concept picked up by the German landshaft geographers in the mid-990s (Hubbard et al, 2004). The concept, however, has arguably been employed for thousands of years before this by Indigenous communities throughout the world who, although very diverse culturally, often have a strong connection to land and place (Deloria Jr., 1999). In every culture, political engagement, artistic production, socialization, spirituality, and virtually every aspect of human life is experienced through place. Think, for instance, of telling somebody your life story without ever referring to the places you have lived. How places are perceived can tell a great deal about the values of an individual or culture, and how places are imagined, through the work of architects, urban planners, or spiritual leaders and Elders, are equally informative. This chapter will explore these ideas through the work of Edward Soja, whose book Thirdspace (1996)
provides details about the *lived* experience of space, which is different from yet incorporates both *perceived* and *conceived* spaces. As Edward Casey relates, both space and place are experienced through a sensation of the sublime, or infinite space, as well as the specific, local environment (Casey, 2005). What is of particular interest to me is how spatial re-arrangements could possibly lead to policy and procedural revisions, a kind of “restructuring-generated crisis” rather than a “crisis-generated restructuring” (Soja, 1996, p.23). This would accomplish the important task of shifting the motivation for political awareness-raising and discourse from a reactive stance to an active, or proactive, one (Philip, 1992, p.59).

There was a glut of analyses of place, space and spatiality in the mid-1990s. Studies of cultures and societies were filtered through methodologies such as “cognitive mapping”, geohistorical analyses, and neo-Marxist critiques of global postmodern spatial relationships of labour, capital and production (Feld & Basso, 1996; Soja, 1996).

Continuing with this line of inquiry we can observe in Egypt and Libya, and in the Occupy Wall Street movement that gained worldwide momentum, studies of transformation of space through direct citizen action are entirely relevant to current cultural studies.\(^{24}\) The aim of this chapter is to develop a language for talking about space

\(^{24}\) While the current Occupy movement does raise interesting questions about agency and space, it is important to note that these movements have been preceded in North America by “sit ins” and other civil rights disobediences including the Red Power movement in the 1960s. (Rutherford, 2011.) The difference between those movements and the current Occupy Movement, however, is the latter reinscribes the nation-state with the power to create jobs, raise minimum wage, and increase corporate taxes, for example, whereas the former sough, as Native activists still seek, to abolish the Indian Act and obtain Indigenous national sovereignty and thus decrease the power of the nation-state (Shiels-Elliot, 2011.)
in order to understand how place is experienced, interpreted, constructed, resisted and lived. The secondary goal of this chapter is to apply some of these insights to the particular space of the North American university campus. While each university is unique, there are many similarities experienced by Native students, staff and faculty that are linked to an ongoing Eurocentric, colonial, and capitalist ethos (Baker, 2008; Battiste, 2000; Deloria Jr., 1999; Monture-Angus, 1995). Transforming space through challenging that which is permissible, desirable, and practical on a university campus will be the subject of Chapter Three, and it is the purpose of this chapter to lay the theoretical groundwork for this succeeding analysis.

Text-based protest actions, such as petitions, pamphlets, and mass email campaigns, and academic work such as theses, conferences and lecture series, are all essential to ongoing anti-colonial resistance movements, but they are only part of a broader approach that needs to include transformations of colonial space. Interventions made by contemporary artists, both in galleries and museums and in public arenas, provide a nuanced cultural disruption of space. These textual and aesthetic practices of resistance add support to but are fundamentally different from simply being in a place where one is regularly “existentially challenged” (West, 1990). This chapter seeks to understand what it means to alter space. Through the work of Edward Soja and Vine Deloria Jr., I explore actions in “real” time and space, and what this means for the socio-cultural vitality of a people. I will attempt to understand how these concepts can be
mobilized with the aim of restructuring spatial possibilities within places of higher learning.

Deloria Jr. suggests that in addition to the regular Western scientific and investigatory questions, “How does it work?” and “What use is it?”, Indigenous scientific knowledge seekers would pose an additional question, “What does it mean?” (1999, p.134). I will use these three questions as the organizational framework for this chapter.

**How does the theory of Thirdspace work?**

Edward Soja’s concept of Firstspace, Secondspace and Thirdspace grew out of Henri Lefebvre’s text *The Production of Space*, written in 1974. Lefebvre, who mainly wrote about Paris, described the “trialectics” of space as being Spatial Practice, Representations of Space, and Spaces of Representation (Soja, 1996, p.65). Soja translated and expanded these concepts into his “ontology of space”, represented in his text as a circular diagram showing how *perceived, conceived* and *lived* spaces influence each other in an ongoing cycle. Perceived space is also known as Firstspace in Soja’s text. Firstspace is not a place, but is rather an understanding of space as that which can be observed empirically. Firstspace epistemologies are often explained as a “formal science of space” (p.75). Methods for perceiving space this way include, for example, quantitative data collecting such as satellite imagery, remote sensing, and other Geographical Information Systems (p.76). Firstspace epistemologies also include behavioural mapping and/or critical human geography, as long as these observations are
made through objective, mechanized methods (p.77). As Soja explains, one of the limiting functions of Firstspace epistemologies is that they often consider space as being manipulated by human or non-human factors, and do not take into account the inverse of this - how spaces construct identities and knowledges.

Secondspace epistemologies conceive of spatiality as a highly subjective experience. Here, explanations of space become highly introspective and individualized. Secondspace poses a challenge to Firstspace understandings, but they can also overlap, especially in the area of human geospatial mapping. Secondspace is the arena of artists, urban planners, and utopian urbanists (p.78). These spaces do not yet exist, or are so subjective as to never have existed at all, as in the “cognitive mapping” experiments that were popularized in the 1990s (p.79).

Thirdspace is both the real and imagined spaces combined. This “space of representation” is the “space of radical openness, the space of social struggle” (p.68). This is lived space, where we actually exist as social beings. Thirdspace is something of a no-place, except as it exists as a “here and now” spatial and temporal experience. As soon as it is rendered material, either visually or textually, the space becomes either perceived (Firstspace) or conceived (Secondspace). This space is ever-changing, dependent upon social and historical contexts. Because Thirdspace is the chaotic, liminal space between perceived and conceived space, and past and future time, It is where power and alterity are accommodated, negotiated and resisted. Thirdspace provides the opportunity for direct action and relationship-building, in ways that are not always anticipated or
observable. Thirdspace is the concept of all spaces and moments together; it is the radically open, infinite space of “The Aleph” (Borges, 1971, as quoted in Soja, 1996). Thirdspace for Soja is a critical possibility. He sees this as an emergent understanding that the reality of existence lies somewhere in between that which is known, or real, and that which is believed, or imagined.

**What use is the theory of Thirdspace?**

The concept of a trialectics of space is useful in that it provides a language for speaking about placemaking. Places are made through these three ways of being in the world. If we are talking about an urban environment, for example, or a University space, Thirdspace provides us with an understanding of the complexity of how policies and planning maps (Secondspace), reviews of policies and actual maps (Firstspace) as well as lived cultural, political and social actions in a given space (Thirdspace) are all equally important in the construction of a place. Thus, Thirdspaces are the sites of power struggle and negotiation, similar to Foucault’s description of “heterotopias” (Soja, 1996, p.145). Using Soja’s systematic description, space is seen and recorded, it is imagined and revised, and it is lived and experienced. The act of living, while simultaneously observing and dreaming what spaces could become, can alter places through, for example, political protests that lead to policy changes; tours that lead to map changes; or activist and artistic interventions that raise awareness about power. Thirdspace concepts of lived social change, rather than material or rhetorical social change, remind us that transformation is
not only possible, but it is *always already* occurring in the messy, lived social environment.

**What does the theory of Thirdspace mean?**

The potential practical application of this theory is by now becoming obvious. Bureaucratic solutions of the type described in Chapter One are insufficient as methods for altering a given place. Space needs to be available for lived, human experiences that have cultural and political significance for non-dominant groups in order for places to be truly accessible for all members of a diverse social community. What is more, there needs to be an understanding of the circle of relationships that exists between, for example, policy drafting, reviews of policies, and lived experiences of place. All three of these activities need the same considerations and support. Just as lobbyists have had difficulty creating change in a given institutional structure without adequate representation within the upper levels of that institution, those who seek to create change in a given environment will struggle without a space in which to experience cultural practices, discuss issues as a group, and simply be present in ways that make sense for the community. Far from this being a segregated space\(^{25}\), these group discussions, political and cultural expressions need to be lived in the heart of an institution’s public space.

---

\(^{25}\) Some activist-scholars have suggested that during social movements there is a need for strategist segregation, or “closed spaces” (O’Brian, 2007). For example, the organizers of the *Writing Thru Race* (1994) conference controversially restricted access to people of colour and First Nations (Gagnon, 2000, p.66).
This concept of the Thirdspace is a departure from Western critical epistemologies, which often analyze space in terms of centre/periphery dialectics, but it is not a new concept for every culture. Vine Deloria Jr. describes a concept in Sioux cosmology that precedes Soja’s text by several centuries. In the Sioux universe, Thirdspace might be understood as the Seventh Ceremonial space (Deloria Jr., p.55). This space is the chaotic “here and now” space, the Seventh Direction after the Four Directions, the Sky, and the Earth. Each ceremony begins with a sacred pipe offering to all seven Ceremonial Directions, but it is in the Seventh Direction, the centre of the universe, that all elements can be brought into harmony and a new beginning must be made. This Seventh Direction is a fluid, never-ending dynamic space, which could be a vision quest pit, a sweat lodge, the bowl of the Pipe itself or a Sun Dance arbor (p.55). The object of the Seventh Ceremonial Direction is to ensure that “all possible elements of the universe must be brought within a harmony; sacrifices must me made to heal the injuries of each party, and a new beginning must be made” (p. 55). In order for all elements of the universe to be brought into harmony, Sioux ceremonies create a space where “all possible times (are) taking place simultaneously” (p.55).

This concept provides an additional element of the radical potential of spatial epistemologies, that of healing, and of bringing disparate elements into harmony through the evocation of the Seventh Ceremonial Direction. By bringing this wisdom to bear on the potential alteration and transformation of colonial space through direct actions, we can see the insight that the Seventh Direction provides. A critical alteration of space
could involve an element of ceremony, to honour actions and people who have been in a space before, who is here now, and future generations. In other words, ceremony and political action are related activities that both depend upon an awareness of the radical limitlessness of spatial understandings. Soja and Deloria Jr. remind us that Western spatial epistemologies are dependent upon positivist methodologies that exclude concepts of hybridity and liminality, and reject data that disrupts perceived spatial reality. Instead, Soja and Deloria Jr. discuss the interconnectedness of space and time, and the reality of overlapping, simultaneous space-times. Soja complicates binaric spatial thinking by insisting that both the centre and the periphery are present in how space is perceived, conceived, and lived. He insists that domination and resistance are not simply questions of where actions are located but are internalized and transcended through the ways in which spatiality is negotiated and resisted in everyday life. He leaves aside static concepts of spatiality to explain how power operates as a constantly moving cycle through perceived, conceived and lived space.

**What could Thirdspace epistemologies mean for placemaking in a university?**

In addition to analyzing urban architectural and exhibitionary space, Soja reflects on how the Thirdspace could operate in institutions of higher learning. He mainly focuses on the constructions of curricula, however. He discusses how, within the human sciences, if we move beyond understandings of human relationships as being shaped by historical or social determining factors, we come to understand that spatial relationships are equally
determinant. Within the space of the university, this is especially true, where individuals and disciplinary canons vie to establish the centrality of certain epistemologies. For example, as Soja describes in *Postmodern Geographies* (1989), Western critical epistemologies tend to reduce discussions into binaries, such as the discussion concerning modernism and postmodernism, Soja describes these reductionist positions as *anti-modernist*, which rejects everything modernist, and *anti-postmodernist*, which rejects postmodernist critiques as a vacuous “anything goes” philosophy (Soja, 1996, p.4). The former is agitating for the abolishment of all canons, and the latter responds with the assertion that not everything can be thrown out, that a foundation needs to be built upon familiar grounds. Soja suggests a Thirdspace can emerge that neither rejects nor embraces either position, but provides an entirely new environment for thought and criticism. Soja suggests this understanding can be applied to all value judgements within academia. For example, the idea that quantitative research is more objective and therefore “better” than qualitative research, or that Western science is more accurate than Indigenous science.26 Changing the fundamental way in which Western epistemologies represent truth and existence is the hardest and the most important step for the

26 This concept stems from the idea that liberal secularism is more “progressive” than the spiritual lifeways of tribal peoples (Deloria Jr., 1999). A common example that is used to remind readers that science and spirituality are necessarily separate, is that of the Three Sisters. When the Settler Nations arrived in the Canadas, they observed that Native Nations was planting corn, beans and squash in shared plots. It wasn’t until the twentieth century that Western science caught up with the fact that the Three Sisters, although a spiritual and ceremonial tradition for many First Nations, creates a natural nitrogen cycle which replenishes the soil for continuous plantation. The science of this was not a shock to many First Nations communities, and White astonishment over this “discovery” is one of many sources of amusement for these Nations (Mt.Pleasant, 2006; Deloria Jr., 1999).
disintegration of the marginalization of Indigenous contributions to knowledge and culture.

The ongoing struggle to make a place in the university space is determined by the epistemological and spatial manifestations of Western “common sense”, which reproduce colonial attitudes towards Indigenous cultural knowledges and lifeways. In other words, colonial imperialisms are not only observable in curricula which ignore Indigenous contributions to science, art, and humanities, or the structural realities of testing, grading, and competitiveness, but also the spatial arrangements of classes and conferences and the campus itself. Emerance Baker’s description of the university as a Kitsu’lt melkiko’tin, or “place of creation”, is useful in determining the possibility for the academic space to become a Thirdspace for Indigenous knowledges (Baker, 2008). The Indigenous “place of creation” that Baker refers to is a spiritually charged location where Elders’ teachings about community, history, and methods for cultural and physical sustainability are imparted. Baker notes that “Indigenous scholarship needs to focus less on decolonizing the academy. We need to focus more on understanding how Indigenous Peoples are implicated as part of this colonized space so that we can better develop our relational accountability no matter where we operate” (p.16). Baker reminds all of us, and Indigenous faculty and students in particular, that as well as critiquing the space of the University, we all need to understand that this space is colonized and therefore re-enacts processes of colonization upon the First Nations engaged with the space. She suggests that the time has come to shift institutional critiques so that they are “less about what the
‘mainstream’ is doing, and more about what we as Indigenous writers are doing and where we are doing this” (p.16).

Gregory Cajete, a Tewa Indian from Santa Clara Pueblo, describes a shared body of understanding among Indigenous peoples that Native education necessarily includes some concept of what Pueblo Indians call “spiritual ecology” (Cajete, 2000). In this worldview, education is connected to places as “the intimate relationship that people establish with place and with the environment and with all of the things that make them or give them life” (Basso, 1996, p.184). For some communities, this requires being physically present in a space that has importance to the cultural past, present and future of that community. This is why altering the physical and cognitive space of a Western campus is necessary before Indigenous students, staff and faculty can feel welcomed, respected and connected to an institution. If spaces are created for the free expression of culture and resistance, an easing of the ping geh heh, or “split mind” feeling of being Indigenous in a colonial space, might be accomplished (Cajete, 2000).

On Western university campuses, a space needs to be made for Indigenous knowledges to come to the fore. These altered spaces could be Indigenous Studies programs, Indigenous scholarship included in all courses, Indigenous professors who can supervise graduate students, Native student centres, Native student groups, conferences and exhibitions that deal with questions of Indigeneity, permanent spaces for pow-wows and ceremonies, and an Indigenous library with texts created by Native scholars and intellectuals. Centralizing non-Western knowledges, which is a trope emerging from
“post pre-fixed” spatial epistemologies (Soja, 1996, p.181), raises many difficult questions. Given the diversity of Native cultures, the question arises as to whose knowledge will or could be centralized? How is this to be carried out in a way that does not perpetuate the mysticism or exoticism of Western appropriations of Indigenous wisdom? Space needs to be created for just such discussions within the boundaries of academic institutions.

**Conclusion**

There is a vital message in the work of Soja because his text supports the idea that governance structures of nations or universities can produce and reproduce identity legislation or policies that affect all subjects generally, and Indigenous Nations specifically, but none of these changes as “improvements” to these top-down bureaucratic solutions will achieve what is already being accomplished in local, community spaces. In Thirdspace, where we actually live, cultural practices are being expressed and celebrated, students are being guided to the appropriate Elders for guidance, and Indigenous knowledges are being passed on to interested and engaged young students. Soja reminds us that these actions can only occur if there are spaces that facilitate their occurrence. Aboriginal Student Centres are often the first site where urban Native and non-Native students come into contact with Indigenous knowledges and ways of being (Lawrence, 2004). For reserve youth, these centres act as a familiar community hub and a place to escape to when faced with the ignorance and violence of Western academic practices and
students (Monture-Angus, 1995). But what if they were not the only place where students could experience and learn about Native knowledges and histories? What if the entire University underwent a “critical thirding”, and Western and Indigenous street and site names, structural formations, and architectural signifiers existed in harmony?

Placemaking could be understood as an important political process, but the changes may only be temporary solutions for the parties involved. Lasting change would result through human use of these transformed spaces.

Emerance Baker’s questions (2008, p.16), what is happening and where is it happening, will be the guiding questions for an analysis of placemaking at Queen’s University in Chapter Three. Ultimately I hope to bring forward with this work an understanding of the importance of Indigenous-centered placemaking within institutional spaces, not just for members of the First Nations, but for all members of the local university community.
Chapter 4

Remaking Place at Queen’s

What would a university in Canada look like if it fully embraced Native architecture, infrastructure and spatial planning? What would a classroom be like, if Native knowledges about agriculture, astronomy, religion, communication and social praxis were included in every related discussion? What would Queen’s be like with a permanent Pow Wow space in the heart of campus, or designated Smudging spaces in every building? This chapter will be a limited review of how the space of Queen’s University is perceived, how it is conceived, and how it is lived. A review of the historical as well as the spatial dimension of place will provide context for the Thirdspace being created at Queen’s, and the chapter will conclude with suggestions that build on discussions initiated by the Queen’s Aboriginal Council, members of the Queen’s Native Student Association (QNSA), and the staff of the Four Directions Aboriginal Student Centre (hereafter referred to as Four Directions) to increase spaces where culture and ceremony can be practiced and explored on campus. Through my research and discussions, developed below, it has become clear to me that until these spaces are extended and made permanent, the campus will continue to reproduce an affect of rigid colonialism and discrimination.

Queen’s University in Kingston, originally Queen’s College, was founded in 1841 as the Scottish Presbyterian seat of learning in the colony of Upper Canada (Neatby, 1978). The University sits on Haudenosaunee Mohawk land, at the mouth of the St.
Lawrence River where it joins Lake Ontario in Eastern Ontario. From the outset, Queen’s has been consciously linked to Scottish culture, especially to elements of piety and religiosity espoused by the Presbyterian clergy. The first Principal, Rev. Thomas Liddell, was revered for his enthusiasm for promoting “the cause of Christ in the province” (p.1). After a great deal of turmoil and financial difficulty, the university was brought into national focus at the turn of the century through the efforts of George Monro Grant. Despite Grant’s modernist aspirations, the aura of piety and morality from earlier eras did not dissipate with the decades. In 1969, when Hilda Neatby (formerly one of the five persons who comprised the infamous Massey Commission from 1949-1951) was commissioned to write the history of Queen’s, she was asked to do so by John Deutsch in part because “her Calvinist convictions, it was considered, would dispose her to a general sympathy with the traditions of Queen’s” (Neatby, 1978, p.xiv).

Except for the notable exception of the Robert Sutherland Hall, named after the first Black of Queen’s, the University building, streets and fields on the main campus of Queen’s University are named after Scottish Chancellors and their successors. Even when the University has attempted to include women in their placemaking practices, it is women of Scottish heritage who are recognized. For instance, Agnes Benidickson Field was named after the first female Chancellor of Queen’s (1980-1996. Agnes McCausland Benidickson was also the daughter of a former Chancellor; honouring her further reinforced a long heritage of Scottish entitlement to the University space. She obtained a BA and an L.L.D from Queen’s. She also received the Order of Canada, and the Order of
Ontario. She died in 2007. She is briefly described on the Queen’s website in relation to the award which was founded in her name, but the field named after her is not labeled on the online Campus Map. Currently, there are no streets, buildings or spaces named after the original Haudenosaunee inhabitants of this space, which gives the impression that the history of this place began in 1841.

All universities experience a certain degree of political upheaval, but the experiences of racialized students, staff and faculty of Queen’s University have been particularly visible. There continues to be a “five-year turnover” rate for non-white faculty and staff at Queen’s University, a figure attributed to systemic racism at Queen’s and in the Kingston area (MacDonald, 2008). Since at least 1991, racial discrimination on campus has been one of the main focuses of the Human Rights and Equity office, the Employment Equity Council and the Senate Education Equity Committee (SEEC), but still a “culture of whiteness” persists at Queen’s University (Henry, 2004; Lewis, 2010). Since the Principal’s Advisory Committee (PAC) report on racism was commissioned in 1991, internal reports have been conducted by the SEEC to assess the school’s hiring, recruiting, admissions, and tenureship procedures. A major report conducted by an outside party, Dr. Frances Henry of York University, followed up and made further

---


28 A search for the words “Agnes Benidickson” on the Queen’s University Campus Map revealed the search results “nothing found”. The Campus Map is available at [http://www.queensu.ca/campusmap/](http://www.queensu.ca/campusmap/)
recommendations (Henry, 2004). The Henry Report was the first to expand upon the issues that separate First Nations from students, staff and faculty of colour:

Aboriginal faculty encounter additional barriers. They too are affected by the culture of Whiteness and its value system, but the Eurocentric aspect of that culture has a particularly powerful affect on Aboriginality. Recognizing the power of the "whole Eurocentric focus in this University, a participant noted that "I really think the prevalence of colonialism and colonialist attitudes is just so profound. Aboriginal faculty feel that their culture is not at all understood in the University atmosphere (Henry, 2004, p.139).

There has also been a follow-up report commissioned by the SEEC which indicates that only minor changes have been implemented from the recommendations of the Henry Report of 2004 (Lewis, 2010). The dominant opinion amongst racialized staff, faculty, students and their allies is that the Queen’s administration does not appreciate how a colonial and racist “climate” is created in both tacit and explicit actions in classrooms, staff rooms, and conferences (Muharaj, 2009). While the administration has made efforts to increase recruitment in “ethnic” centres in Canada and abroad, it continues to espouse a White, Scottish-centric culture as the public “spirit” of the school with campaigns such as “Queen’s Loves U” during which tams, chants, bagpipes, and Gaelic-themed celebrations did little to include Aboriginal students, among others, in the culture of the University. In response to the Queen’s Loves U campaign, an article was published in The Journal in which a student reporter stated, “We were not supposed to

---

29 This separation between First Nations and persons of colour is extremely important for organizations that operate on the community level to understand and address. The Canada Council for the Arts, for example, created the First Peoples Advisory Committee and the Advisory Committee of Racial Equality following the request of Chris Creighton-Kelly in 1990-91. (Robertson, 2006, p.53) It is surprising that a separate investigatory body has not been created to address this reality at Queen’s University, although this process has been initiated by the Queen’s Equity Office as explained in this chapter.
exist in a space where we are despised simply for being who we are, be it non-white, poor, disabled, queer, trans, fat or as we’re coming to discuss now, if you have ‘mental health issues’” (Abdelmahmoud & Bissoondial, 2011). This situation persists despite the reinstitutionalizing solutions implemented by the Queen’s administration. The feeling of existing outside of an inner circle of privileged, White, straight, and able-bodied students is compounded for many Native students by an absence of Native Language courses, Native histories and knowledges included in the curricula of multiple disciplines, and a very low number of Native faculty who can supervise theses dealing with Indigenous scholarship.  

As an indicator of Queen’s graduate scholarly output, from 1990 to 2010, only 75 theses and dissertations have been written that include the words “Indigenous” or “Native” in their titles and abstracts, out of a total of approximately 9,000 theses and dissertations produced overall. This means that since the publication of the PAC report in 1991, less than 1% of the graduate program knowledge produced at Queen’s University specifically considers the needs and realities of Native Nations in Canada.

30 Appendix 9 of the Aboriginal Review Document prepared for the Queen’s administration following a series of consultation meetings, described below, the number of Aboriginal faculty at Queen’s is listed as between 15 - 20 out of 2009 total faculty members. Available at [http://www.queensu.ca/equity/userfiles/Aboriginal_Review_document_public.pdf](http://www.queensu.ca/equity/userfiles/Aboriginal_Review_document_public.pdf)  
31 This information was obtained by a Q-Space library search of all theses and dissertations produced at Queen’s University since January 1, 1990 and December 31, 2010. I chose these dates because they capture a 20 year period which also happens to be the period of time between the first commission report on race and racialization, the PAC report, and the last commissioned report, by Magda Lewis et al in 2010. Approximately 230 theses and dissertations came up in the initial search, however after going through these individually I removed any documents relating to Aboriginal peoples from other countries such as Australia and New Zealand, and any documents which used these words in a different context, as in plants or technologies which were “indigenous” to certain countries. The abstracts for the final count of 75 theses and dissertations are available at the Four Directions Aboriginal Student Centre, located at 146 Barrie Street, on Queen’s University campus.
Although there have been several conferences and symposia at Queen’s over this period, as well as guest lectures and the occasional inclusion of Native scholarship into humanities reading lists, changes to the structure of the university are incrementally slow. As Janice Hill, the director of Four Directions, observes, if one were to walk through Queen’s, it would be impossible to tell that there are Aboriginal students attending this University at all (Fernandez-Blance & Lancaster, 2011). This does not imply that students at Queen’s are not active, as the QNSA is extremely vibrant and conscientious in their efforts to organize events and raise awareness. The comment speaks to the overall White, Eurocentric “climate” of the physical place of this campus.

There is some support at Queen’s for expressions of Native culture and knowledge in Secondspace. In other words, there is evidence that at the level of Academic Planning and in the actions of recruiting officers, Queen’s is being conceived of as welcoming environment for Native students, staff and faculty. For example, there exists an Aboriginal Recruitment and Admissions Representative who works out of Four Directions, who is provided with welcoming brochures and print resources, the creation of which is funded, in part, by the Office of the Provost and Vice-Principal (Academic). Unfortunately, there also exist telling absences of clear, welcoming initiatives that would further encourage and welcome Native students to Queen’s University. On the University’s home page of their website, there is not a single link to the Four Directions Aboriginal Centre which would assist First Nations students in understanding what Queen’s has to offer their communities, nor is there a menu option which provides
information to potential First Nations students on the “Apply to Queen’s” page. These absences of clear references to Native members of the Queen’s community do little to support the administration’s print materials which conceive of this space as being open to culturally diverse communities.

There also seems to be a degree of interest in determining what kind of space Queen’s is, at least from the Human Rights and Equity Office, some faculty and a few members of the Queen’s administration. These Firstspace activities include the above reports which focus on how space at Queen’s is perceived from the point of view of non-White, and as I explain below, Native views as well.

However, there are only a handful of spaces that can be considered Thirdspaces, sites where culture and power is lived, negotiated, and resisted through Native cultural practices, discussions, and ceremonies. These three “spaces” refer to the ontology of spatiality found in Edward Soja’s text, Thirdspace, which I discussed in Chapter Two (Soja, 1996).

This chapter will look briefly at activities carried out in all three spaces - perceived, conceived, and lived - to more fully illustrate that until space is viewed as a constant fluid cycle in which all three environments are considered, Queen’s University will not become a space that is inclusive of Native students, staff and faculty.
**Firstspace: Perceived Space**

As discussed in this chapter’s preamble, Queen’s University administration, namely the Vice-Principal (Academic) office, has been attempting to address diversity-related issues and concerns on campus by carrying out “taking stock” reviews and reports since at least 1989. By outlining these Firstspace epistemologies I am not suggesting that they have been ineffective or unwarranted, only that policy changes and reviews of policy changes are not going to create lasting spatial changes until actual lived environments are included in the discussion of space.

These reports and reviews of reports of Queen’s University, and these theses relating to what is happening at Queen’s, are examples of what Soja refers to as “perceived” space. They also discuss what could or should happen in the future of this place, but their main focus is to provide readers with an understanding of what they consider to be ongoing inequitable environment for non-White students, staff and faculty. As such, they map relationships between students and professors, and between faculty members, and taken together form a kind of human geographical matrix with White, upper and middle-class students and faculty obtaining awards and other indications of vertical mobility, and everyone “else” feeling overworked and overlooked. In this regard, Nathalie Muharaj’s MA thesis (2009) reveals that the ongoing effects of racism at Queen’s University “relate to the marginalization of scholarship, student discrimination, excessive workloads, tenure, an absence of support and social isolation, and the resulting affects of discrimination” (p.80). It seems that despite the long and vocal history of
reporting and reviewing, very little has changed in terms of the problematic “sense of place” (Basso & Feld, 1996) for non-White individuals at Queen’s since the late 1980s.

For example, although the Henry Report does refer to the difference between “racial minority” and Aboriginal members of the Queen’s community, many feel as though there has been a lack of focused analysis of the issues specific to the First Nations on campus. On April 6th, 2011, a major protest was staged by the Aboriginal Council of Queen’s and the QNSA, demanding that a report specifically dealing with discrimination against Aboriginal staff, students and faculty be commissioned by the SEEC through the Equity and Human Rights Office. The meetings that resulted from this are examples of how lived space changed, and the subsequent reports are examples of how perceived and conceived spaces are effected by ceremony, discussion, and debate.

**Secondspace: Conceived Space**

There are many alternative ways in which Indigenous students and staff are actively participating in the transformation of space at Queen’s University. One such activity is a document created in consultation with the Queen’s Equity Office and the Queen’s Aboriginal Council, and the Elders and community members from the

---

32 A Vision Gathering Process report was prepared by the Aboriginal Council of Queen’s University in collaboration with the Equity Office, Tyendinaga community members, and the Donald Gordon Centre in Kingston, Ontario (Aboriginal Council of Queen’s, 2011). As a result of this vision gathering process, a public report was created by the Queen’s University Equity Office for the SEEC (Queen’s University Equity Office, 2011).
Tyendinaga Mohawk Territory of the Bay of Quinte, Ontario. In a sense, these meetings could be seen as being Firstspace, in that the discussions focused in part on the physical and psychological space of Queen’s University, but they ultimately are part of Secondspace epistemological investigating, as they sought to envision a new space in this environment that could be more inclusive of Native students, staff and faculty. Broadly speaking, the final report calls for policies and discussions which support “ways that value the contributions of Aboriginal students, staff and faculty members and relate to every aspect of the institution, including: the recruitment and admission of students, advising, curriculum, pedagogy, assessment, convocation, research methodologies, recruitment and hiring of staff, conflict resolution processes, recruitment and appointment of faculty, human resources policies and collective agreements, scholarship etc”.

The four main recommendations of this report call for the development of a Native strategy and action plan for Queen’s, the development of an effective Queen’s Aboriginal Council led by Native members; the development of the Four Directions Aboriginal Student Centre, and a space for ongoing communication between Native and non-Native Queen’s community members (p.6-7). The full report is available through the

---

33 Further to footnote 31, in February of 2011, the Vision Gathering Report was created when Queen’s Human Rights and Equity Office staff members Irène Bujara and Heidi Penning, Elders and Professors Marlene Brant Castellano (Emeritus), Dr. Eileen Antone and Professor Shirley Williams, Provost Silverman and Peggy Watkin (the Provost’s delegate on the Aboriginal Council), representatives of QNSA, and Dr. Mark Green, Co-Chair of the Aboriginal Council met and discussed issues important to First Nations membership in the Queen’s University community.

34 The aforementioned public report, created by the Equity Office for the SEEC, is entitled Meeting the Needs of Aboriginal Students, Staff and Faculty: A Review. It is available at [http://www.queensu.ca/equity/userfiles/Aboriginal_Review_document_public.pdf](http://www.queensu.ca/equity/userfiles/Aboriginal_Review_document_public.pdf) and through the Equity Office at Queen’s University.
Human Rights and Equity Office at Queen’s, but I would like to point out that two of these four recommendations are concerned with space. All four are intended to dramatically change the current non-inclusive place of Queen’s University for Native students, staff and faculty.

Out of these meetings came another Secondspace epistemology: the “Aboriginal Council Visioning Map”.35 (See Fig. 1 and 2) This map is a beautiful depiction of the goals and aspirations developed by the Native Elders, students, faculty and staff. They are printed as large, colourful posters which are still on display in areas in campus which attract new or prospective students, faculty and staff who may be looking for further information about Queen’s University, such as beside the information desk in the Registrar’s office. The content of these picture-text discussion maps includes the need for regular Pow Wows and ceremonies, Native ceremonial actions such as the presentation of a feather upon graduation; the protocol of thanking of Anishinabe and Haudenosaunee Nations for the use of the land at the outset of conferences, symposia, and other gatherings; and the centering of the Four Directions Aboriginal Student Centre from the geographical margins of campus to a location in the heart of the University. This poster impacts the social construction of space on campus. It communicates to viewers in a non-

35 Orloff, A. (2011). (With additions made by Mimi Gellman). Aboriginal Council Visioning Map. Aboriginal Council of Queen’s University, Kingston, ON. This map was realized at the suggestion of Ojibway/Jewish Métis PhD candidate Mimi Gellman who knew of the work of Avril Orloff. Orloff is an artist and Graphic Facilitator who lives in Vancouver, BC. Her practice includes meeting with organizations, corporations and community groups to draw a visual map of the group’s oral conversations. These maps contribute to the group’s evolving collective memory in ways that inspire continued collaboration and discussion. (Information about her work can be found here: http://avrilorloff.com/)
invasive, visually-appealing, and silently powerful way. They impact incoming Native students, faculty and staff in that they point to an active Native community on campus while simultaneously indicating this space and community is always changing and transforming in an ongoing process of becoming.

**Thirdspace: Lived Space**

The Thirdspace, or “lived space” on campus, needs to be given primacy at least temporarily to rebalance the ontological cycle of spatiality (Soja, 1996). While Firstspace and Secondspace activities are crucial, Thirdspaces have been marginalized as Native students, staff and faculty are compelled to construct their own spaces within the structure of an overly colonial environment. In this section, I will look at the resistance to colonial space that is being constructed at Queen’s through the efforts of the Four Directions Centre, the QNSA, and the individuals who support their activities. The Director of Four Directions, Janice Hill, is a strong support for students and allies who are interested in learning about, supporting, and engaging in Indigenous cultural life on campus. Through a brief, narrative analysis of the 5th Annual Aboriginal Educational Pow Wow that I participated in on October 1st, 2011, I hope to reveal how “living” in a space defined by Native cultures has a profound effect on Native and Non-Native students, staff and faculty, and why more of these spaces and opportunities need to be created on Queen’s campus before change can be truly felt.
Partly this story will be told following the methodology provided by Patricia Monture-Angus. In her book, *Thunder in My Soul* (1995), Monture-Angus describes an experience she had at a conference about racism and the law in the late 1980s. She states clearly that her experience there, as she heard and responded to the casual violence of several of the White conference participants in a state of extreme emotion, is both a phenomenological account of her reality in that space and a story told in the Mohawk tradition. She did not guide the reader to think about her experiences in a way that revealed her viewpoint to be logical or justified. She simply stated what happened, how she was feeling, and where she placed her body in space so as to overcome her discomfort and exhaustion. She went for walks, visited Mother Earth at a stream by the conference, and sat beside women whom she felt were comforting. This beautifully written story of her hurt and recovery at one conference was, she was careful to explain, part of a circle of experiences she has traveled through seemingly without end. Her brief story was both research and personal narrative, and communicates much more powerfully than any survey or statistic about how everyday racism works and feels on a racialized community member.

I will use this type of story-telling in my phenomenological account of my first Pow Wow. The personal narrative as research methodology has been elucidate by Margaret Kovach as an appropriate and legitimate methodology for describing an experience or reality (Kovach, 2010). In her book *Indigenous Methodologies*, Kovach describes both a “story as method” and a “situating self and culture” methodologies.
which are relevant to the next few pages. Kovach also describes how these are similar to Western qualitative methodologies of participant observation, for example, but are distinct in their open-ended character which resist mono-linear readings. Telling this story using Indigenous methodological practices I will attempt to provide opportunities for insight and awareness. There could be many interpretations of my experiences that day. In and of itself, my experience transformed my understanding of how space works, what use it is, and what it means.36

This Indigenous methodological practice has great affinity with the narrative methodology described by Laurel Richardson and Elizabeth Adams St. Pierre as “writing as a method of inquiry” (2005). This creative analytical processes (CAP) is a genre of ethnography that has been particularly useful for “the development of ethical selves engaged in social action and social reform” (p.959). St. Pierre reminds us that “creative” and “analytical” are not contradictory modes of understanding as ethnographic studies have come to include poetry, theater, prose, museum displays, etc. She states that “no textual staging is ever innocent”, (p.960) meaning that in the postmodern context all writing is understood to be narrative writing. Rather than validating my thoughts and feelings using interviews, census data, and documents,37 I have recorded my experience during the Pow Wow as a subject who is actively engaged in knowing/telling. In some

-------------------------

36 This quote is again building on what Deloria Jr. describes as a typical question that a Native knowledge seeker would pose in order to solve or gain insight into a problem (Deloria Jr., 1999, p.55).

37 This method is known as “triangulation”, and assumes there is a fixed point - an object of study that can be triangulated. For a full description see Denzin, 1978.
sections, I will engage in a discursive critique in order to analyze the meanings produced by certain speakers.

It is my belief that this “story as method” framework is the most effective in order to place the reader in the real-and-imagined *thirdspace*. In the following section, readers will accompany me through my recollections of the 5th Annual Educational Pow Wow, Queen’s University campus, on October 1st, 2011. Throughout the narrative, it should become clear that this physical transformation of a site that is textually under review through documentation, reports, etc, completes a cycle of change that is necessary for a lasting transformation of spatiality.

*A Pow Wow on Campus*

On the morning of the Pow Wow, I woke up long before dawn, and made my way to campus for the Sunrise Ceremony. It was dark, very cold, and windy, and I arrived on the field to find an absence of activity. Two cars at the far end were parked with their lights on so I made my way across the field to them. I passed ghostly empty event tents on my way. I was feeling unsure of my place here, as if I had expected a bigger group to be already assembled around a fire.

A woman with whom I had had a couple of conversations was in one of the vehicles. I asked her if I could warm up in her truck, and she opened her door. We were waiting, I was told, for the Fire Keeper. A few other people came and sat outside on the grass. The Fire Keeper arrived and began setting up an iron drum on the pavement. It was
shaped like a shallow basin on legs and it was where the fire would be created. I got out of the truck to watch and assist. He stacked wood near the drum, and emptied a plastic bag of rocks that were clearly hand-picked, around the fire in a circle. This, he explained, would be to catch the traveling embers. Another two bags of sand were emptied in a circle around the fire for the same purpose. The east side of the circle of rocks and sand was the Eastern Doorway, he explained, and was left open so the Ancestral Spirits could join us.

We started introducing ourselves. There were four Elders and I learned that some newcomers were exchange students from Japan, Jamaica and China. They were told about the Pow Wow from their History professor, and they had come to learn more about “Canadian culture”. I noticed that none of the Elders felt the need to explain the difference between Canadian culture and Aboriginal culture, and the power dynamics between the two, as I might have mentioned. Instead the Elders smiled and expressed their gratitude that the Creator had led them all this way to be around the fire on this day.

Beside the fire, on blankets, the Fire Keeper and the Elder who would be carrying out the Sunrise Ceremony, laid out bowls of medicines and explained their significance - cedar, tobacco, bitterroot, and sweetgrass. They set up their staffs with skulls and feathers attached, and explained the significance of this.

The fire is not essential to the Sunrise Ceremony, but having a fire brings the Ceremony closer to how it has traditionally been carried out, and so arguably the fire is very important. My thoughts about how the University administration perceived this fire
were then validated by the comments of the Fire Keeper. He explained that if we were in
the woods, he would have built a bigger fire in a pit that he would have dug out of the
earth, but Queen’s had policies about digging; it was prohibited because of the pipes and
wires lying under the ground. I asked him how he would feel if Queen’s had
commissioned a raised ground in this field, which could have been used to create fire pits
for these ceremonies. Grinning, he said that would be the ideal scenario, but it would
never happen. He said Sunrise Ceremonies, as part of the annual Pow Wows at Queen’s,
were only a few years old. It was only in the past couple of years that Queen’s had
granted permission for an open fire.

When the chanting began, we were eight around the fire, with the Fire Keeper
outside, occasionally adding wood to reignite the blaze. He traveled around the inside of
the circle and smudged each of us in turn with cedar and sweetgrass, both front and back.
The Stone Elder leading the chanting asked us to join hands to protect him and the fire,
and he again explained the different medicines he was going to offer to the fire and the
spirits. The three Elders smiled widely at us four, cold young people. They had come
prepared in many layers of warm sweaters and coats. The eighth participant was the
Queen’s Vice-Principal of Finance and Administration, although I wouldn’t learn this
until later in the day. We stood holding hands and listening to the chanting for a long
time, huddled against the cold. The Stone language that the Elder was chanting rose and
fell with the wind, and enveloped all of us in a spirit of ritual and ceremony. At the end of
the ceremony I left to warm up in a nearby building.
Later, coming around the corner into the field once more, I stopped in my tracks, floored by the transformation of space. The tents were now full and bustling with activity. Different dried herb medicines were hanging above singers and drummers in a tent in the middle of a circle of hay strewn thickly on the grass. I had just missed the introduction of the “MC”, who took the microphone and commenced his role in the ceremony. Dancers in ceremonial dress were already being introduced by the MC on a microphone, and his voice boomed from a dozen speakers arranged around the field. The fire was on the other side of the field, behind some trees and a path, a bit separate but still very present. Further along the same path were about ten booths which I didn’t visit immediately.

Arranged around the field, mingling with the audience, were young dancers, Elders dancing, elaborate costumes with head-dresses rising several feet into the air, jingle dresses, shawls and coverings. A group of Armed Forces men and women were standing with an officer wearing his uniform and ceremonial feathers, decorative bands and head gear. The colours, noise, and presence of over 500 participants and observers was overwhelming after the morning’s quiet, small ceremony.

Commencing the ceremony, as the Grass Dancers assembled, the MC reminded the crowd that no photos, cameras or other recording devices were permitted. A central tent in the field was full of singers and drummers who were also projected through the sound system to all of us watching. Soon it was time for the Grand Entry, and I was

---

38 In order to write my report, I first approached Janice Hill, the director of the Four Directions Aboriginal Student Centre and asked whether it would be appropriate for me to take notes during the Pow Wow, for the purposes of writing this chapter. She was very encouraging in her email back, and in subsequent meetings about the event. (Janice Hill, Personal communication, September 29, 2011.)
surprised to see the Principal, looking somewhat conspicuous in his dark suit and long black trench coat, walking with the director of the Aboriginal Student Centre. I realized that I had assumed that Queen’s administration would be “unable to attend”. I wondered what other assumptions I had made about the audience of this event. The Grand Entry consisted of all the groups that had come from local and distant areas walking in a circle around the Singers’ Tent, in what struck me as a powerful representation of unity and celebration of Aboriginal cultural continuity. The Flag ceremony, including the Flag Song, followed the Grand Entry.

Representatives from each Nation stood with their Nation’s flag and the MC introduced each in turn. There were Mi’kmaq, Inuit, Anishinaabe, Haudenosaunee, and Métis Nations represented. Once the flags had been placed beside the tent poles of the Singers’ Tent, there was a Circle for Veterans. The MC thanked those who had sacrificed their lives overseas, and those who had returned to join us but were forever changed by their experiences. The Armed Forces and others in support walked in a Circle around the Singers’ tent, and singing and drumming also accompanied their sombre march.

After this, the MC introduced the Principal, I noted that the MC referred to him using his first name, but referred to everyone else by their first and last names. I took out my notebook because I wanted to record exactly how the Principal publicly represented his support for this event. The Principal opened with an announcement of his full name and title, and the following:

There are many facilities on Queen’s Campus for Aboriginal Students. There is the Four Directions Centre and several groups which have received support from
provincial programs and from Queen’s as well. It is great to see students out here today, and the soldiers and veterans. Also today we are experiencing one of the joys of being in Ontario with the changing of the seasons. There are many wonderful booths on display today, and I hope you have a chance to explore these booths. Have a wonderful day.

The Principal talked more about Queen’s than about Aboriginal community, culture, strength, or needs. He didn’t say anything about how events such as this were vital to raising awareness that there is an important Aboriginal presence on campus. I noted that he didn’t acknowledge the Mohawk or Iroquois Nations as the original inhabitants of the land we were standing on, a common and easy show of respect which is practiced regularly at other events I’ve attended. In fact, he didn’t thank even the MC and everyone else for the opportunity to be there and to address the group. He did mention the word “booths” twice, and I made a note to visit the booths to discover what he might be so keen on having us all “explore”.

The MC said, “Thank you. And now for a different personality, here is the director of the Aboriginal Student Centre!” The Principal and the Director of the Centre both laughed as she accepted the microphone.

The Director spent several minutes thanking all the volunteers, sponsors and participants who had made the Pow Wow possible. Unfortunately her voice did not transmit as clearly through the speakers as some of the mens, and I gave up straining to hear her and take notes. I looked instead to the faces of people she was addressing.

39 I was reminded of Prime Minister’s “apology” for residential school systems, in which what he didn’t say, for example that schools continue to be colonial spaces that erase Indigeneity, is just as noteworthy as what he did say (Canadian Press. (2008, June 11). PM cites ‘sad chapter’ in apology for residential schools”. CBC News. Retrieved from http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/story/2008/06/11/aboriginal-apology.html)
watched their smiles and nods, and judged she was expressing gratitude and welcoming words to the many people who made the day possible.

Following the Director’s comments, a woman from the TD Bank, one of the main sponsors, said “We are extremely honoured to participate today and we look forward to working together with you in the future.” I thought about this succinct and friendly response in relation to the Principal’s. It seemed somehow more appropriate.

The Academic Vice-Principal and Dean of Student Affairs then spoke, and said she echoed the former speaker’s sentiments. She was honoured to be there, and hoped everyone had a wonderful time at Queen’s. The MC received the mic and made one last, seemingly unexpected announcement that another person needed to say a couple of words, somebody who has been “such a support to Aboriginal students and staff” at Queen’s. He called on the Vice-Principal of Finance and Administration to come to the microphone, and she came, surprised, to say a couple of words. I immediately recognized that she had been one of the eight of us around the fire in the Sunrise Ceremony. I noticed the Principal was already making his departure as the MC said jokingly (and yet not jokingly) to the crowd that we “release you from your duties here”.

The Vice-Principal of Finance and Administration began with a joke about the cold weather and how they had run out of money and could not pay a well-known weather spirit - she used a name I did not catch clearly and couldn’t record. Many people laughed. She said that there was a great deal of strength and spirit at this Pow Wow despite the cold, and she was very happy to see such a turnout. She thanked everyone for
coming and thanked the Director of the Student Centre for all that she had done for the community, and wished everyone a happy day here at Queen’s. It was a respectful, short speech that also showed knowledge of Aboriginal spirituality. I thought, it was so easy for her to do this, because she cares enough to listen and learn.

Following her speech, there was a Circle for Queen’s Students, which I hung back from out of uncertainty but was invited to participate in by the wild gesturing of a friend and fellow student. I walked around the Circle feeling out of place, like a colonial imposter, but as with the Sunrise Ceremony, I slowly began to feel enveloped in the friendliness of the ceremony. I moved my feet in time to the drum, and the circle moved us all forward together.

Following this Circle, the Women Dancers had their circle, and the Ottawa Little Creek Dancers also had a Circle. Then the MC announced that a song would be sung that “gave thanks that we have the wisdom, honour and strength to survive as many nations in this land”. A man’s haunting but powerful voice filled the space, and his notes struck me as being mournful yet strong. I didn’t understand the words.

I left shortly after “exploring the booths” as the Principal had suggested. I wondered whether he specifically wanted us to purchase the jewelry, hats, soaps or medicinal products created by Indigenous artisans, or did he want us to stop at the Alma Mater Society booth to find out about the Queen’s alumni society? Or find out about the Aboriginal Educational Program in the Department of Education on West Campus? He didn’t specify, but I began to wonder whether his attitude towards the events of the day
was one of consumption rather than participation. His “groups and booths” speech struck me as out of place in an otherwise gift-rich day.

I suppose I shouldn’t have been surprised with his omissions. The document, “Where next?” created in January 2010 is a “personal vision document” that makes suggestions for future directions for the curriculum, research focus and teaching and learning goals, ultimately calling for a University Planning Committee composed of academics and administrators to develop the Academic Plan. “Where next?” does not include the words “First Nations”, “Native”, or “Aboriginal” anywhere in its 53 pages (Woolf, 2010). But I felt sure that the space would have an impact on him, and he would experience the truth of Native contributions to the Queen’s community. I felt sure he would see, and feel, that these kinds of spaces were exactly what Queen’s students need. Native students could experience the centralizing, rather than the marginalizing, of a recognizable cultural spirit, and non-traditional Native students, White, Black, Asian and Muslim students could all learn about and appreciate the Native Nations whose land we are on. But instead the Principal appeared uncomfortable, and he left without speaking words that could have healed his community, and provided hope for Native students who feel alienated here.

**Conclusion**

What I have outlined in this chapter is how reports commissioned by Queen’s administration, follow-up reviews and recommendations are important to ongoing
discussions about how a university space might change and evolve, but what is truly missing at Queen’s University are enough lived spaces where culture, politics and ceremonies can be practiced and experienced by everyone. The Four Directions Centre provides students with a space which they are free to define on their own terms, and the regular Feast Days, New Moon Ceremonies, and other social and ceremonial activities are vital to Native students, staff and faculty on Queen’s campus, but this centre is one of the only spaces on campus in which many Native community members feel their culture is respected and understood.

If I were to suggest changes to Queen’s campus, my suggestion would include the creation of permanent spaces on campus where Indigenous visual culture and histories can be experienced. These are not recommendations, but ideas that I hope will spark further discussion. For example, a space which discusses the history of the Haudenosaunee Tribes whose land Kingston and Queen’s University occupies would be one such idea. Also, if there are willing Elders available, a map of this area with the “long” history of Eastern Ontario, rather than the “short” history of the colonial mid 19th century, could be commissioned by the Ontario Arts Council. This would disrupt the current trend in Kingston which is to honour colonial figures such as Sir John A. McDonald without taking into account that his life was one small chapter in the history of this place, and it was a sad chapter for the Iroquois of the Frontenac area.

40 Danielle Fostey, QNSA President, personal communication, November 30, 2011.
Placemaking, in the form of renaming a space in honour of somebody other than the White Chancellors and Principals of Queen’s University, is another idea worth considering. For instance, the Agnes Benidickson field is where the Annual Educational Pow Wows’ take place, yet this place is not listed on the Campus Map. Why not rename this place, and have a ceremony to re-make the site into a permanent Native space in the heart of campus? Of course a simple renaming is a weak gesture, but recreating the space with Haudenosaunee art and plaques which discuss the rich history of this place, may provide a space where Native students feel as though they are in a space open to and respectful of Indigenous Nations. In terms of what name to use, one suggestion could be Dr. Clare Clifton Brant, who is Mohawk from Tyendinaga. Interestingly, upon graduation he founded the Native Mental Health Association of Canada. He was the first Aboriginal student to graduate from Queen’s, and he once said, “it took five years at Queen’s University to turn him into a doctor, and another five years in psychoanalysis to restore his identity as a Native person” (Petten, 2003). Honouring those First Nations, especially those whose Nation originally inhabited the land on which Queen’s sits, who have passed through the doors of Queen’s and survived the rigidity of this colonial space, curriculum, and administration, is long overdue. It is my hope that these suggestions will spark debates within the Queen’s community among Native and non-Native staff, faculty and students.
Chapter 5

Final Words

On the front page cover of a 2011 *Alumni Review*, the magazine of Queen’s University, there is a full page image of seven young women Highland Scottish dancing (Fig. 3). They are in stockinged feet on the grass in a location presumably on campus, wearing red tartan kilts, white blouses, and dark green vests. Cut into this image is a small, black and white image of other Highland dancers. The use of a black and white image reveals that the editors of this Issue intend to set up Highland dancing as a long tradition at Queen’s. This impression is reinforced by the large white text of the caption which reads, “It’s what this place has always been about”. This issue clearly reinforces the identity of Queen’s University as a Scottish Presbyterian seat of learning in Upper Canada. Scottish culture, as evidenced by the Queens Loves U campaign, is perceived by Principal Woolf and other members of the administration and student council as unifying the Queen’s community despite the fact that many members of this community view this as a foreign European culture imported into Canadian space for the consolidation of a Settler hegemony.

---

41 The Contents Page reveals that the photo was taken in 1965 during Orientation Week. The contemporary photo was taken in September 2011, by Greg Black, during Orientation Week’11.

42 The full quote reads “A sense of community and shared values...it’s what this place has always been about”. However, the first part of this text is small and blends in with the background (because the designer has chosen orange text on a red background), and the text is therefore much more clearly linked to the images of the highland dancers than the sentence’s prefix.
It is within the context of this imposed character of the campus that First Nations students, staff and faculty negotiate the fact that Indigenous spaces and practices are marginalized on campus, and Indigenous scholarship is omitted from the vast majority of courses in offered at Queen’s. White culture persists as the overriding “climate” of the space despite the Henry Report, the follow-up reports, and the reports created in collaboration with the Queen’s Aboriginal Council and the Queen’s Equity Office, detailed above.

So what does need to change? How can this come about?

I suggest that, quite simply, if Native students, staff and faculty could walk through the university space, and see aspects of Native cultures represented in the physical space of campus, this would go a long, long way to establishing a non-Eurocentric space. I am suggesting this because of my research into how space “works” using the theoretical framework of Edward Soja as it applies to my own experience of a particular place and time. Any administration that takes into account only policy documents and reviews, and not the physical space itself, is going to fail to address the real needs of a diverse community. In a university space where administrations come and go frequently, and politics change as each wave of “visioning” out-stages that which has gone before, it makes sense to alter the physical space of campus as a reminder to everyone that this is a space where Native students, staff and faculty contribute to the community socially, culturally, and academically.
In addition to the suggestions I outline above, I am cognizant of the fact that the scale of certain institutions that could ameliorate the current climate of Queen’s University for the long term would likely have to include spaces such as a socio-cultural Indigenous-focused (and governed) research centre, a First Nations museum, a Native Performing Arts Centre, or the Ontario base of the Assembly of First Nations. These community spaces would be the kind of institutions that would draw the support and engagement necessary to redefine Queen’s University as an Indigenous seat of innovation in Upper Canada.

These physical changes need to be created in collaboration with Native councils on each campus. As mentioned in the Introduction, it makes sense for some communities to create smudging spaces or permanent sites for Pow Wows, but not all Native Nations practice these ceremonies. Therefore the starting point for the discussion would be an educational period, where the administrations of each university learn about the rich history of the Nations who originally lived on the land on which the campus sits. This will have the added effect of informing the non-Native university administrators into the ongoing vitality of Native Nations; how they have retained a sense of identity, and what the obstacles to this have been throughout the centuries.

Some of my reviewers may wish to see a more expanded comparative analysis of how other Canadian universities have transformed space and the sociological and cultural impacts of these transformations. However, to return to the Aboriginal Council Visioning Map, I can only state that I do not see it as my role in this discussion to provide further
examples for change that are already illuminated by the *Map* itself. This thesis is not intended to provide a clear way to "solve" the problem of diversity on campus, and I fear that writing about what other universities have done to change space, and whether or not they have been successful, would fundamentally alter the nature of my project.

As utopian and unrealistic it sounds, it strikes me that transformation of Canadian colonial institutional spaces is an inevitable process in the long run. As there is greater and greater pressure lobbied by the Native and non-Native public about the issues affecting First Nations communities, the Canadian government is obligated to address inequitable cultural effects of stilted land claims processes, cuts to health and educational funding, etc. In terms of Canadian institutions, this process began in the elementary school systems. Training teachers to teach the true history of Canada, training librarians to order books about Native knowledges and culture, and training school administrators to double check the curricular and extracurricular materials and activities in which Canadian children engage are just some of the ways which will trigger lasting change. Space and spatiality might seem like an odd access point for this discussion. However, if our universities do not provide an environment from which these trainings can logically stem, the project will likely remain suspended in its current stasis of animation.
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